

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01914233 0







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# THE LIBRARY OF ORATORY

*Ancient and Modern*

*with CRITICAL STUDIES of the  
WORLD'S GREAT ORATORS  
by EMINENT ESSAYISTS*

**CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW, LL.D.**

*United States Senator from the State of New York*

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**NATHAN HASKELL DOLE**

**CAROLINE TICKNOR & THOMAS CHARLES QUINN**

**ASSOCIATE EDITORS**

**Edition de Luxe**

**IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES**

**VOLUME IX.**

**ILLUSTRATED**

**THE CURRENT LITERATURE PUBLISHING CO.**

**NEW YORK**

---

**COPYRIGHT, 1902,**

BY

**J. C. TICHENOR**

---



**MAY 11 1956**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## VOLUME IX

	BORN.	PAGE.
SIR JOHN ALEXANDER MACDONALD . . . . .	1815	1
Speech on Canadian Confederation.		
From Speech on Canadian Fisheries . . . . .		26
PRINCE BISMARCK . . . . .	1815	38
A Plea for Imperial Armament.		
Against Liberalism; A Prussian Royalist		
Confession of Faith . . . . .		57
ANDREW GREGG CURTIN . . . . .	1817	62
The People's Heritage Squandered.		
JOHN ARMOR BINGHAM . . . . .	1815	77
Speech on the Sectional Party.		
ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY . . . . .	1815	93
Sermon: Jesus of Nazareth.		
FREDERICK WILLIAM ROBERTSON . . . . .	1816	100
Sermon: The Loneliness of Christ.		
NEWMAN HALL . . . . .	1816	114
Sermon: Christian Victory.		
HENRY LAWRENS DAWES . . . . .	1816	124
On the Indian Policy.		
FREDERICK DOUGLASS . . . . .	1817	133
What the Black Man Wants.		
Inauguration of the Freedmen's Memorial		
Monument to Abraham Lincoln . . . . .		144

		BORN.	PAGE.
JOHN JAY . . . . .	America Free—or America Slave.	1817	159
HENRY WINTER DAVIS . . . . .	On Reconstruction.	1817	175
JOHN BARTHOLOMEW GOUGH . . . . .	Temperance Address.	1817	184
RAMON DE CAMPOAMOR . . . . .	Speech against the Press Law.	1817	205
GEORGE SEWALL BOUTWELL . . . . .	On the Progress of American Independence	1818	223
WILLIAM MAXWELL EVARTS . . . . .	What the Age owes to America.	1818	238
SIR SAMUEL LEONARD TILLEY . . . . .	On National Policy.	1818	251
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN BUTLER . . . . .	Character and Results of the War.	1818	264
JOHN ALBION ANDREW . . . . .	The Eve of War.	1818	295
	In Honor of Patriot Heroes . . . . .		304
	On the Return of the Battle Flags . . . . .		311
	Valedictory Address . . . . .		313
JOHN RUSKIN . . . . .	On the Greek Myths.	1819	345
JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL . . . . .	Oration at the 250th Anniversary of the Founding of Harvard College.	1819	354
	A Plea for the Modern Languages . . . . .		374
EDWIN PERCY WHIPPLE . . . . .	Patriotic Oration at Boston, July 4, 1850.	1819	398

	BORN.	PAGE.
SIR LYON (LORD) PLAYFAIR . . . . .	1819	413
The Evolution of University Extension.		
CHARLES KINGSLEY . . . . .	1819	428
Sermon: The Transfiguration.		
JOSIAH GILBERT HOLLAND . . . . .	1819	439
Eulogy of Abraham Lincoln.		
PRESTON SMITH BROOKS . . . . .	1819	453
Speech on the Sumner Assault.		
FRANCESCO CRISPI . . . . .	1819	458
Address to the Italian Electors.		
HENRY JARVIS RAYMOND . . . . .	1820	470
Speech on Reconstruction.		
LORD COLERIDGE . . . . .	1820	478
On the Value of Clear Views as to the Laws		
Regulating the Enjoyment of Property.		

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

### VOLUME IX

---

	OPP. PAGE
<b>BISMARCK</b> .....	38
<b>WILLIAM M. EVARTS</b> .....	238
<b>FRANCESCO CRISPI</b> .....	458
(viii)	

# SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD



**IGHT HON. SIR JOHN ALEXANDER MACDONALD, K. C. B.,** distinguished Canadian statesman and chief promoter of Confederation, was born at Glasgow, Scotland, Jan. 11, 1815, and died at Ottawa, Canada, June 6, 1891.

Removing with his parents to British America in 1820, the family settled near Kingston, Upper Canada, where the future statesman received his education at the Royal Grammar School. He afterwards studied law and was admitted to the Upper Canada Bar. The era succeeding the rebellion is the turning-point in the political history of the Canadas. It is the era in which reform was to see its work crowned in the overthrow of the oligarchical "Family Compact," in the application of the elective principle to the irresponsible legislative council, and the full attainment of responsible government. It was at this period (1844) that Sir John Macdonald entered political life, and by his abilities and readiness in debate gained that commanding position in Canadian politics, at the head of the Conservative party, which secured him in later years a long lease of power. Macdonald attained office, first as Receiver-General and afterwards as Commissioner of Crown Lands. After an experience in opposition, Mr. Macdonald became Attorney-General in the coalition government of 1854, and two years later assumed the Premiership. His political fortunes varied considerably down to the period of Confederation, which was brought about by a deadlock of parties, the contest being one of race and religion, as well as of faction strife. When the Union was consummated, in 1867, he became Premier, and acted as Attorney-General and Minister of Justice, while the seat of government was permanently located at Ottawa. With the acquisition of the Northwest and the entrance of British Columbia into the Confederation, there came the need of railway construction to connect the Pacific colony with the provinces in the east. At first, political difficulties brought a crisis upon the country, in which Sir John Macdonald's administration fell, in 1873, owing to its being implicated in corrupt dealings with the proposed contractors for the railroad. In 1878, however, he regained power, and continued until his death at the head of a Liberal-Conservative administration. In 1871, he acted as one of the high commissioners in the settlement of the "Alabama" Claims and the initiation of the Washington Treaty of that year, and he visited London in 1880 to arrange with the Imperial authorities the terms for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad. Sir John possessed in a remarkable degree the art of governing, and though his political methods were often open to criticism, he has left an indelible impress upon his country.

## SPEECH ON CANADIAN CONFEDERATION

DELIVERED IN THE CANADIAN PARLIAMENT, FEBRUARY, 1865

[The Dominion of Canada was born July 1, 1867. In February, 1865, the proposed union was discussed in the Parliament of Canada. Sir E. P. Taché moved a series of resolutions in the Legislative Council, while Attorney-General Macdonald

[afterward Sir John) moved a resolution in the Legislative Assembly to the effect that the colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island should be united in one government, with provisions based on certain resolutions which were adopted at a conference of delegates from the said colonies, held at the city of Quebec on the 10th of October, 1864. In moving this resolution Mr. Macdonald made what is possibly his most famous speech.]

**M**R. SPEAKER,—In fulfilment of the promise made by the government to Parliament at its last session, I have moved this resolution. I have had the honor of being charged, on behalf of the government, to submit a scheme for the confederation of all the British North American Provinces,—a scheme which has been received, I am glad to say, with general if not universal approbation in Canada. The scheme, as propounded through the press, has received almost no opposition. While there may be occasionally, here and there, expressions of dissent from some of the details, yet the scheme as a whole has met with almost universal approval, and the government has the greatest satisfaction in presenting it to this House.

This subject, which now absorbs the attention of the people of Canada and of the whole of British North America, is not a new one. For years it has more or less attracted the attention of every statesman and politician in these provinces, and has been looked upon by many far-seeing politicians as being eventually the means of deciding and settling very many of the vexed questions which have retarded the prosperity of the colonies as a whole, and particularly the prosperity of Canada. The subject was pressed upon the public attention by a great many writers and politicians; but I believe the attention of the legislature was first formally called to it by my honorable friend the Minister of Finance. Some years ago, in an elaborate speech, my honorable friend, while an independent member of Parliament, before being con-

nected with any government, pressed his views on the legislature at great length and with his usual force. But the subject was not taken up by any party as a branch of their policy until the formation of the Cartier-Macdonald administration in 1858, when the confederation of the colonies was announced as one of the measures which they pledged themselves to attempt, if possible, to bring to a satisfactory conclusion. In pursuance of that promise the letter or despatch which has been so much and so freely commented upon in the press and in this House was addressed by three of the members of that administration to the Colonial Office.

The subject, however, though looked upon with favor by the country, and though there were no distinct expressions of opposition to it from any party, did not begin to assume its present proportions until last session. Then men of all parties and all shades of politics became alarmed at the aspect of affairs. They found that such was the opposition between the two sections of the Province, such was the danger of impending anarchy in consequence of the irreconcilable differences of opinion with respect to representation by population between Upper and Lower Canada, that unless some solution of the difficulty was arrived at we would suffer under a succession of weak governments,— weak in numerical support, weak in force, and weak in power of doing good. All were alarmed at this state of affairs. We had election after election, we had ministry after ministry, with the same result. Parties were so equally balanced that the vote of one member might decide the fate of the administration and the course of legislation for a year or a series of years.

This condition of things was well calculated to arouse the earnest consideration of every lover of his country, and I am happy to say it had that effect. None were more impressed

by this momentous state of affairs, and the grave apprehensions that existed of a state of anarchy destroying our credit, destroying our prosperity, destroying our progress, than were the members of this present House; and the leading statesmen on both sides seemed to have come to the common conclusion that some step must be taken to relieve the country from the deadlock and impending anarchy that hung over us. With that view my colleague, the President of the Council, made a motion founded on the despatch addressed to the Colonial Minister, to which I have referred, and a committee was struck, composed of gentlemen of both sides of the House, of all shades of political opinion, without any reference to whether they were supporters of the Administration of the day or belonged to the Opposition, for the purpose of taking into calm and full deliberation the evils which threatened the future of Canada.

That motion of my honorable friend resulted most happily. The committee, by a wise provision — and in order that each member of the committee might have an opportunity of expressing his opinions without being in any way compromised before the public or with his party in regard either to his political friends or to his political foes — agreed that the discussion should be freely entered upon without reference to the political antecedents of any of them, and that they should sit with closed doors, so that they might be able to approach the subject frankly and in a spirit of compromise. The committee included most of the leading members of the House, — I had the honor myself to be one of the number; and the result was that there was found an ardent desire — a creditable desire I must say — displayed by all the members of the committee to approach the subject honestly, and to attempt to work out some solution which might relieve Canada from

the evils under which she labored. The report of that committee was laid before the House, and then came the political action of the leading men of the two parties in this House, which ended in the formation of the present government. The principle upon which that government was formed has been announced and is known to all. It was formed for the very purpose of carrying out the object which has now received to a certain degree its completion, by the resolutions I have had the honor to place in your hands.

As has been stated, it was not without a great deal of difficulty and reluctance that that government was formed. The gentlemen who compose this government had for many years been engaged in political hostilities to such an extent that it affected even their social relations. But the crisis was great, the danger was imminent, and the gentlemen who now form the present administration found it to be their duty to lay aside all personal feelings, to sacrifice in some degree their position, and even to run the risk of having their motives impugned, for the sake of arriving at some conclusion that would be satisfactory to the country in general. The present resolutions were the result. And, as I said before, I am proud to believe that the country has sanctioned, as I trust that the representatives of the people in this House will sanction, the scheme which is now submitted for the future government of British North America.

Everything seemed to favor the project, and everything seemed to show that the present was the time, if ever, when this great union between all her Majesty's subjects dwelling in British North America should be carried out. When the government was formed it was felt that the difficulties in the way of effecting a union between all the British North American colonies were great,— so great as almost, in the opinion of

many, to make it hopeless. And with that view it was the policy of the government, if they could not succeed in procuring a union between all the British North American colonies, to attempt to free the country from the deadlock in which we were placed in Upper and Lower Canada, in consequence of the difference of opinion between the two sections, by having a severance, to a certain extent, of the present union between the two Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and the substitution of a federal union between them. Most of us, however,—I may say, all of us,—were agreed,—and I believe every thinking man will agree,—as to the expediency of effecting a union between all the Provinces, and the superiority of such a design, if it were only practicable, over the smaller scheme of having a federal union between Upper and Lower Canada alone.

By a happy concurrence of events the time came when that proposition could be made with a hope of success. By a fortunate coincidence the desire for union existed in the Lower Provinces, and a feeling of the necessity of strengthening themselves by collecting together the scattered colonies on the seaboard had induced them to form a convention of their own for the purpose of effecting a union of the Maritime Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, the legislatures of those colonies having formally authorized their respective governments to send a delegation to Prince Edward Island for the purpose of attempting to form a union of some kind. Whether the union should be federal or legislative was not then indicated, but a union of some kind was sought for the purpose of making of themselves one people instead of three.

We, ascertaining that they were about to take such a step, and knowing that if we allowed the occasion to pass, if they

did indeed break up all their present political organizations and form a new one, it could not be expected that they would again readily destroy the new organization which they had formed,—the union of the three Provinces on the seaboard,—and form another with Canada,—knowing this, we availed ourselves of the opportunity and asked if they would receive a deputation from Canada who would go to meet them at Charlottetown for the purpose of laying before them the advantages of a larger and more extensive union by the junction of all the Provinces in one great government under our common sovereign. They at once kindly consented to receive and hear us. They did receive us cordially and generously and asked us to lay our views before them. We did so at some length, and so satisfactory to them were the reasons we gave; so clearly, in their opinion, did we show the advantages of the greater union over the lesser, that they at once set aside their own project, and joined heart and hand with us in entering into the larger scheme, and trying to form, as far as they and we could, a great nation and a strong government.

Encouraged by this arrangement, which, however, was altogether unofficial and unauthorized, we returned to Quebec, and then the government of Canada invited the several governments of the sister colonies to send a deputation here from each of them for the purpose of considering the question with something like authority from their respective governments.

The result was that when we met here on the tenth of October, on the first day on which we assembled, after the full and free discussions which had taken place at Charlottetown, the first resolution now before this House was passed unanimously, being received with acclamation as, in the opinion of every one who heard it, a proposition which ought to receive

the sanction of each government and each people. The resolution is:

“That the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America will be promoted by a federal union under the Crown of Great Britain, provided such union can be effected on principles just to the several Provinces.”

It seemed to all the statesmen assembled,— and there are great statesmen in the Lower Provinces, men who would do honor to any government and to any legislature of any free country enjoying representative institutions,— it was clear to them all that the best interest and present and future prosperity of British North America would be promoted by a federal union under the Crown of Great Britain. And it seems to me, as to them, and I think it will so appear to the people of this country, that if we wish to form — using the expression which was sneered at the other evening — a great nationality, commanding the respect of the world, able to hold our own against all opponents, and to defend those institutions we prize; if we wish to have one system of government and to establish a commercial union with unrestricted free trade between people of the five Provinces, belonging, as they do, to the same nation, obeying the same sovereign, owning the same allegiance, and being, for the most part, of the same blood and lineage; if we wish to be able to afford to each other the means of mutual defence and support against aggression and attack, — this can only be obtained by a union of some kind between the scattered and weak boundaries composing the British North American Provinces.

The very mention of the scheme is fitted to bring with it its own approbation. Supposing that in the spring of the year 1865 half a million of people were coming from the United Kingdom to make Canada their home; although they brought

only their strong arms and willing hearts; though they brought neither skill nor experience, nor wealth,— would we not receive them with open arms and hail their presence in Canada as an important addition to our strength? But when, by the proposed union, we not only get nearly a million of people to join us; when they contribute not only their numbers, their physical strength, and their desire to benefit their position; but when we know that they consist of old-established communities, having a large amount of realized wealth — composed of people possessed of skill, education, and experience in the ways of the New World — people who are as much Canadians, I may say, as we are — people who are imbued with the same feelings of loyalty to the queen and the same desire for the continuance of the connection with the mother country as we are, and at the same time having a like feeling of ardent attachment for this our common country, for which they and we would alike fight and shed our blood, if necessary,— when all this is considered, argument is needless to prove the advantage of such a union.

There were only three modes — if I may return for a moment to the difficulties with which Canada was surrounded — only three modes that were at all suggested by which the deadlock in our affairs, the anarchy we dreaded, and the evils which retarded our prosperity, could be met or averted. One was the dissolution of the union between Upper and Lower Canada, leaving them as they were before the union of 1841. I believe that that proposition, by itself, had no supporters. It was felt by everyone that, although it was a course that would do away with the sectional difficulties which existed; though it would remove the pressure on the part of the people of Upper Canada for the representation based upon population, and the jealousy of the people of Lower Canada

lest their institutions should be attacked and prejudiced by that principle in our representation; yet it was felt by every thinking man in the Province that it would be a retrograde step which would throw back the country to nearly the same position as it occupied before the union; that it would lower the credit enjoyed by United Canada; that it would be the breaking up of the connection which had existed for nearly a quarter of a century, and, under which, although it had not been completely successful, and had not allayed altogether the local jealousies that had their root in circumstances which arose before the union, our Province, as a whole, had nevertheless prospered and increased. It was felt that a dissolution of the union would have destroyed all the credit that we had gained by being a united Province, and would have left us two weak and ineffective governments instead of one powerful and united people.

The next mode suggested was the granting of representation by population. Now, we all know the manner in which that question was and is regarded by Lower Canada; that, while in Upper Canada the desire and cry for it was daily augmenting, the resistance to it in Lower Canada was proportionably increasing in strength. Still, if some such means of relieving us from the sectional jealousies which existed between the two Canadas, if some such solution of the difficulties as confederation had not been found, the representation by population must eventually have been carried, no matter though it might have been felt in Lower Canada as being a breach of the treaty of union, no matter how much it might have been felt by the Lower Canadians that it would sacrifice their local interests, it is certain that in the progress of events representation by population would have been carried; and, had it been carried — I speak here my own individual senti-

ments — I do not think it would have been for the interests of Upper Canada. For although Upper Canada would have felt that it had received what it claimed as a right, and had succeeded in establishing its right, yet it would have left the Lower Province with a sullen feeling of injury and injustice. The Lower Canadians would not have worked cheerfully under such a change of system, but would have ceased to be what they are now — a nationality, with representatives in Parliament, governed by general principles, and dividing according to their political opinions, and would have been in great danger of becoming a faction, forgetful of national obligations, and actuated only by a desire to defend their own sectional interests, their own laws, and their own institutions.

The third and only means of solution for our difficulties was the junction of the Provinces either in a federal or a legislative union. Now, as regards the comparative advantages of a legislative and a federal union, I have never hesitated to state my own opinions. I have again and again stated in the House that, if practicable, I thought a legislative union would be preferable. I have always contended that if we could agree to have one government and one Parliament legislating for the whole of these peoples it would be the best, the cheapest, the most vigorous, and the strongest system of government we could adopt.

But on looking at the subject in the conference, and discussing the matter as we did, most unreservedly and with a desire to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, we found that such a system was impracticable. In the first place it would not meet the assent of the people of Lower Canada, because they felt that in their peculiar position — being in a minority, with a different language, nationality, and religion from the majority — in case of a junction with the other Provinces, their

institutions and their laws might be assailed, and their ~~ancestral~~ associations, on which they prided themselves, attacked and prejudiced; it was found that any proposition which involved the absorption of the individuality of Lower Canada — if I may use the expression — would not be received with favor by her people.

We found, too, that though their people speak the same language and enjoy the same system of law as the people of Upper Canada, a system founded on the common law of England, there was as great a disinclination on the part of the various Maritime Provinces to lose their individuality as separate political organizations as we observed in the case of Lower Canada herself. Therefore we were forced to the conclusion that we must either abandon the idea of union altogether, or devise a system of union in which the separate provincial organizations would be in some degree preserved so that those who were, like myself, in favor of a legislative union, were obliged to modify their views and accept the project of a federal union as the only scheme practicable, even for the Maritime Provinces. Because, although the law of those Provinces is founded on the common law of England, yet every one of them has a large amount of law of its own,— colonial law framed by itself, and affecting every relation of life, such as the laws of property; municipal and assessment laws; laws relating to the liberty of the subject and to all the great interests contemplated in legislation; we found, in short, that the statutory law of the different Provinces was so varied and diversified that it was almost impossible to weld them into a legislative union at once.

Why, sir, if you only consider the innumerable subjects of legislation peculiar to new countries, and that every one of those five colonies had particular laws of its own, to which its

people had been accustomed and are attached, you will see the difficulty of effecting and working a legislative union and bringing about an assimilation of the local as well as general laws of the whole of the Provinces. We in Upper Canada understand, from the nature and operation of our peculiar municipal law, of which we know the value, the difficulty of framing a general system of legislation on local matters which would meet the wishes and fulfil the requirements of the several Provinces. Even the laws considered the least important — respecting private rights in timber, roads, fencing, and innumerable other matters, small in themselves, but in the aggregate of great interest to the agricultural class, who form the great body of the people — are regarded as of great value by the portion of the community affected by them. And when we consider that every one of the colonies is a body of law of this kind, and that it will take years before those laws can be assimilated, it was felt that at first, at all events, any united legislation would be almost impossible. I am happy to state — and indeed it appears on the face of the resolutions themselves — that as regards the Lower Provinces a great desire was evinced for the final assimilation of our laws. One of the resolutions provides that an attempt shall be made to assimilate the laws of the Maritime Provinces and those of Upper Canada, for the purpose of eventually establishing one body of statutory law founded on the common law of England, the parent of the laws of all those Provinces.

One great objection made to a federal union was the expense of an increased number of legislatures. I will not enter at any length into that subject, because my honorable friends, the Finance Minister and the President of the Council, who are infinitely more competent than myself to deal with matters of this kind — **matters of account** — will, I think, be able to

show that the expenses under a federal union will not be greater than those under the existing system of separate governments and legislatures. Here, where we have a joint legislature for Upper and Lower Canada, which deals not only with subjects of a general interest common to all Canada, but with all matters of private right and of sectional interest, and with that class of measures known as "private bills," we find that one of the greatest sources of expense to the country is the cost of legislation. We find, from the admixture of subjects of a general with those of a private character in legislation, that they mutually interfere with each other; whereas, if the attention of the legislature was confined to measures of one kind or the other alone, the session of Parliament would not be so protracted and therefore not so expensive as at present.

In the proposed constitution all matters of general interest are to be dealt with by the general legislature; while the local legislatures will deal with matters of local interest which do not affect the confederation as a whole, but are of the greatest importance to their particular sections. By such a division of labor the sittings of the general legislature would not be so protracted as even those of Canada alone. And so with the local legislatures: their attention being confined to subjects pertaining to their own sections, their sessions would be shorter and less expensive.

Then, when we consider the enormous saving that will be effected in the administration of affairs by one general government; when we reflect that each of the five colonies has a government of its own with a complete establishment of public departments and all the machinery required for the transaction of the business of the country; that each has a separate executive, judicial, and militia system; that each Province has a separate ministry, including a minister of militia, with a

complete adjutant-general's department; that each has a finance minister, with a full customs and excise staff; that each colony has as large and complete an administrative organization with as many executive officers as the general government will have,— we can well understand the enormous saving that will result from a union of all the colonies, from their having but one head and one central system. We in Canada already know something of the advantages and disadvantages of a federal union.

Although we have nominally a legislative union in Canada; although we sit in one Parliament, supposed constitutionally to represent the people without regard to sections or localities,— yet we know, as a matter of fact, that since the union in 1841 we have had a federal union, that, in matters affecting Upper Canada solely, members from that section claimed and generally exercised the right of exclusive legislation, while members from Lower Canada legislated in matters affecting only their own section. We have had a federal union in fact, though a legislative union in name; and in the hot contests of late years, if on any occasion a measure affecting any one section were interfered with by the members from the other,— if, for instance, a measure locally affecting Upper Canada were carried or defeated, against the wishes of its majority, by one from Lower Canada,— my honorable friend, the President of the Council, and his friends denounced with all their energy and ability such legislation as an infringement of the rights of the Upper Province. Just in the same way, if any act concerning Lower Canada were pressed into law, against the wishes of the majority of her representatives, by those from Upper Canada, the Lower Canadians would rise as one man and protest against such a violation of their peculiar rights.

The relations between England and Scotland are very simi-

lar to that which obtains between the Canadas. The union between them in matters of legislation is of a federal character, because the Act of Union between the two countries provides that the Scottish law cannot be altered except for the manifest advantage of the people of Scotland. This stipulation has been held to be so obligatory on the legislature of Great Britain that no measure affecting the law of Scotland is passed unless it receives the sanction of a majority of the Scottish members in Parliament. No matter how important it may be for the interests of the empire as a whole to alter the laws of Scotland, no matter how much it may interfere with the symmetry of the general law of the United Kingdom, that law is not altered except with the consent of the Scottish people as expressed by their representatives in Parliament. Thus we have in Great Britain to a limited extent, an example of the working and effects of a federal union as we might expect to witness them in our own confederation.

The whole scheme of confederation as propounded by the conference as agreed to and sanctioned by the Canadian government, and as now presented for the consideration of the people and the legislature, bears upon its face the marks of compromise. Of necessity there must have been a great deal of mutual discussion. When we think of the representatives of five colonies, all supposed to have different interests, meeting together, charged with the duty of protecting those interests and of pressing the views of their own localities and sections, it must be admitted that had we not met in a spirit of conciliation and with an anxious desire to promote this union; if we had not been impressed with the idea contained in the words of the resolution,—“that the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America would be promoted by a federal union under the Crown of Great

Britain,"—all our efforts might have proved to be of no avail. If we had not felt that, after coming to this conclusion, we were bound to set aside our private opinions on matters of detail; if we had not felt ourselves bound to look at what was practicable,—not obstinately rejecting the opinions of others nor adhering to our own; if we had not met, I say, in a spirit of conciliation, and with an anxious, overruling desire to form one people under one government, we never would have succeeded.

With these views we press the question on this House and the country. I say to this House, if you do not believe that the union of the colonies is for the advantage of the country, that the joining of these five peoples into one nation under one sovereign is for the benefit of all, then reject the scheme. Reject if you do not believe it to be for the present advantage and future prosperity of yourselves and your children. But if, after a calm and full consideration of this scheme, it is believed, as a whole, to be for the advantage of this Province,—if the House and country believe this union to be one which will ensure for us British laws, British connection, and British freedom, and increase and develop the social, political, and material prosperity of the country,—then I implore this House and the country to lay aside all prejudices and accept the scheme which we offer. I ask this House to meet the question in the same spirit in which the delegates met it. I ask each member of this House to lay aside his own opinions as to particular details and to accept the scheme as a whole if he think it beneficial as a whole.

As I stated in the preliminary discussion, we must consider this scheme in the light of a treaty. By a happy coincidence of circumstances, just when an administration had been formed in Canada for the purpose of attempting a solution

of the difficulties under which we labored, at the same time the Lower Provinces, actuated by a similar feeling, appointed a conference with a view to a union among themselves, without being cognizant of the position the government was taking in Canada. If it had not been for this fortunate coincidence of events, never, perhaps, for a long series of years would we have been able to bring this scheme to a practical conclusion. But we did succeed. We made the arrangement, agreed upon the scheme, and the deputations from the several governments represented at the Conference went back pledged to lay it before their governments, and to ask the legislatures and people of their respective Provinces to assent to it. I trust the scheme will be assented to as a whole. I am sure this House will not seek to alter it in its unimportant details; and if altered in any important provisions the result must be that the whole will be set aside and we must begin *de novo*. If any important changes are made, every one of the colonies will feel itself absolved from the implied obligation to deal with it as a treaty, each Province will feel itself at liberty to amend it *ad libitum* so as to suit its own views and interests; in fact, the whole of our labors will have been for naught, and we will have to renew our negotiations with all the colonies for the purpose of establishing some new scheme.

I hope the House will not adopt any such course as will postpone, perhaps forever, or at all events for a long period, all chances of union. All the statesmen and public men who have written or spoken on the subject admit the advantages of a union if it were practicable; and now, when it is proved to be practicable, if we do not embrace this opportunity, the present favorable time will pass away, and we may never have it again. Because, just so surely as this scheme is defeated, will be revived the original proposition for a union of the

Maritime Provinces irrespective of Canada; they will not remain as they are now, powerless, scattered, helpless communities; they will form themselves into a power which, though not so strong as if united with Canada, will nevertheless be a powerful and considerable community, and it will be then too late for us to attempt to strengthen ourselves by this scheme, which, in the words of the resolution, "is for the best interests and present and future prosperity of British North America."

If we are not blind to our present position we must see the hazardous situation in which all the great interests of Canada stand in respect to the United States. I am no alarmist, I do not believe in the prospect of immediate war. I believe that the common sense of the two nations will prevent a war; still we cannot trust to probabilities. The government and legislature would be wanting in their duty to the people if they ran any risk. We know that the United States at this moment are engaged in a war of enormous dimensions, that the occasion of a war with Great Britain has again and again arisen and may at any time in the future again arise. We cannot foresee what may be the result; we cannot say but that the two nations may drift into a war as other nations have done before. It would then be too late, when war had commenced, to think of measures for strengthening ourselves or to begin negotiations for a union with the sister Provinces.

At this moment, in consequence of the ill feeling which has arisen between England and the United States,—a feeling of which Canada was not the cause,—in consequence of the irritation which now exists owing to the unhappy state of affairs on this continent, the reciprocity treaty, it seems probable, is about to be brought to an end; our trade is hampered by the passport system, and at any moment we may be de-

prived of permission to carry our goods through United States channels; the bonded goods system may be done away with, and the winter trade through the United States put an end to. Our merchants may be obliged to return to the old system of bringing in, during the summer months, the supplies for the whole year. Ourselves already threatened, our trade interrupted, our intercourse, political and commercial, destroyed, if we do not take warning now when we have the opportunity, and, while one avenue is threatened to be closed, open another by taking advantage of the present arrangement and the desire of the Lower Provinces to draw closer the alliance between us, we may suffer commercial and political disadvantages it may take long for us to overcome.

The conference having come to the conclusion that a legislative union, pure and simple, was impracticable, our next attempt was to form a government upon federal principles which would give to the general government the strength of a legislative and administrative union while at the same time it preserved that liberty of action for the different sections which is allowed by a federal union. And I am strong in the belief that we have hit upon the happy medium in those resolutions, and that we have formed a scheme of government which unites the advantages of both, giving us the strength of a legislative union and the sectional freedom of a federal union, with protection to local interests.

In doing so we had the advantage of the experience of the United States. It is the fashion now to enlarge on the defects of the constitution of the United States, but I am not one of those who look upon it as a failure. I think and believe that it is one of the most skilful works which human intelligence ever created; is one of the most perfect organizations that ever governed a free people. To say that it has some defects

is but to say that it is not the work of Omniscience, but of human intellects. We are happily situated in having had the opportunity of watching its operation, seeing its working from its infancy till now. It was in the main formed on the model of the constitution of Great Britain, adapted to the circumstances of a new country, and was perhaps the only practicable system that could have been adopted under the circumstances existing at the time of its formation. We can now take advantage of the experience of the last seventy-eight years during which that constitution has existed, and I am strongly in the belief that we have in a great measure avoided in this system which we propose for the adoption of the people of Canada the defects which time and events have shown to exist in the American constitution.

In the first place, by a resolution which meets with the universal approval of the people of this country, we have provided that for all time to come, so far as we can legislate for the future, we shall have as the head of the executive power the sovereign of Great Britain. No one can look into futurity and say what will be the destiny of this country. Changes come over nations and peoples in the course of ages. But so far as we can legislate we provide that for all time to come the sovereign of Great Britain shall be the sovereign of British North America. By adhering to the monarchical principle we avoid one defect inherent in the constitution of the United States. By the election of the President by a majority and for a short period, he never is the sovereign and chief of the nation. He is never looked up to by the whole people as the head and front of the nation. He is at best but the successful leader of a party. This defect is all the greater on account of the practice of re-election. During his first term of office he is employed in taking steps to secure his own re-election, and for his

party a continuance of power. We avoid this by adhering to the monarchical principle — the sovereign whom you respect and love. I believe that it is of the utmost importance to have that principle recognized so that we shall have a sovereign who is placed above the region of party — to whom all parties look up — who is not elevated by the action of one party nor depressed by the action of another, who is the common head and sovereign of all.

In the constitution we propose to continue the system of responsible government which has existed in this Province since 1841, and which has long obtained in the mother country. This is a feature of our constitution as we have it now, and as we shall have it in the federation in which, I think, we avoid one of the great defects in the constitution of the United States. There the President, during his term of office, is in a great measure a despot, a one-man power, with the command of the naval and military forces; with an immense amount of patronage as head of the executive, and with the veto power as a branch of the legislature; perfectly uncontrolled by responsible advisers, his Cabinet being departmental officers merely, whom he is not obliged by the constitution to consult with unless he chooses to do so.

With us the sovereign, or in this country the representative of the sovereign, can act only on the advice of his ministers, those ministers being responsible to the people through Parliament. Prior to the formation of the American Union, as we all know, the different States which entered into it were separate colonies. They had no connection with each other further than that of having a common sovereign, just as with us at present. Their constitutions and their laws were different. They might and did legislate against each other, and when they revolted against the mother country

they acted as separate sovereignties and carried on the war by a kind of treaty of alliance against the common enemy. Ever since the Union was formed, the difficulty of what is called "State rights" has existed, and this had much to do in bringing on the present unhappy war in the United States. They commenced, in fact, at the wrong end. They declared by their constitution that each State was a sovereignty in itself, and that all the powers incident to a sovereignty belonged to each State, except those powers which by the constitution were conferred upon the general government and Congress.

Here we have adopted a different system. We have strengthened the general government. We have given the general legislature all the great subjects of legislation. We have conferred on them, not only specifically and in detail, all the powers which are incident to sovereignty, but we have expressly declared that all subjects of general interest not distinctly and exclusively conferred upon the local governments and local legislatures shall be conferred upon the general government and legislature. We have thus avoided that great source of weakness which has been the cause of the disruption of the United States. We have avoided all conflict of jurisdiction and authority, and if this constitution is carried out, as it will be in full detail in the imperial act to be passed if the colonies adopt the scheme, we will have in fact, as I said before, all the advantages of a legislative union under one administration, with at the same time the guaranties for local institutions and for local laws which are insisted upon by so many in the Provinces now, I hope, to be united.

I think it is well that in framing our constitution our first act should have been to recognize the sovereignty of her

Majesty. I believe that while England has no desire to lose her colonies, but wishes to retain them; while I am satisfied that the public mind of England would deeply regret the loss of these Provinces — yet, if the people of British North America, after full deliberation, had stated that they considered it was for their interest, for the advantage of the future British North America, to sever the tie, such is the generosity of the people of England that, whatever their desire to keep these colonies, they would not seek to compel us to remain unwilling subjects of the British Crown. If, therefore, at the conference, we had arrived at the conclusion that it was for the interest of these Provinces that a severance should take place, I am sure that her Majesty and the imperial Parliament would have sanctioned that severance. We accordingly felt that there was a propriety in giving a distinct declaration of opinion on that point, and that in framing the constitution its first sentence should declare that “The executive authority or government shall be vested in the sovereign of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and be administered according to the well-understood principles of the British constitution, by the sovereign personally, or by the representative of the sovereign duly authorized.”

That resolution met with the unanimous assent of the conference. The desire to remain connected with Great Britain and to retain our allegiance to her Majesty was unanimous. Not a single suggestion was made that it could by any possibility be for the interest of the colonies, or of any section or portion of them, that there should be a severance of our connection. Although we knew it to be possible that Canada, from her position, might be exposed to all the horrors of war by reason of causes of hostility arising

between Great Britain and the United States,— causes over which we had no control and which we had no hand in bringing about,— yet there was a unanimous feeling of willingness to run all the hazards of war, if war must come, rather than lose the connection between the mother country and these colonies.

We provide that “the executive authority shall be administered by the sovereign personally, or by the representative of the sovereign duly authorized.” It is too much to expect that the queen should vouchsafe us her personal governance or presence except to pay us — as the heir-apparent to the throne, our future sovereign, has already paid us — the graceful compliment of a visit. The executive authority must therefore be administered by her Majesty’s representative. We place no restriction on her Majesty’s prerogative in the selection of her representative. As it is now, so it will be if this constitution is adopted. The sovereign has unrestricted freedom of choice. Whether in making her selection, she may send us one of her own family, a royal prince, as a viceroy to rule over us, or one of the great statesmen of England to represent her, we know not. We leave that to her Majesty in all confidence. But we may be permitted to hope that when the union takes place, and we become the great country which British North America is certain to be, it will be an object worthy the ambition of the statesmen of England to be charged with presiding over our destinies.

## FROM SPEECH ON CANADIAN FISHERIES

DELIVERED MAY 5, 1872

**T**O come to the various subjects which interest Canada more particularly. I will address myself to them in detail, and first I will consider the question of most importance to us, the one on which we are now specially asked to legislate, that which interests Canada as a whole most particularly, and which interests the Maritime Provinces especially,—I mean the articles of the treaty with respect to our fishery rights.

I would in the first place say that the protocols which accompany the treaty, and which are in the hands of every member, do not give chronologically an every-day account of the transactions of the conference, although as a general rule I believe, the protocols of such conferences are kept from day to day; but it was thought better to depart from the rule on this occasion, and only to record the conclusions arrived at. Therefore, while the protocols substantially contain the result of the negotiations ended in the treaty, they must not be looked upon as chronological details of facts and incidents as they occurred.

I say so because the protocol which relates more especially to the fisheries would lead one to suppose that at the first meeting and without previous discussion the British commissioners stated "that they were prepared to discuss the question of the fisheries, either in detail or generally, so as either to enter into an examination of the respective rights of the two countries under the treaty of 1818 and the general law of

nations, or to approach at once the settlement of the question on a comprehensive basis."

Now the fact is that it was found by the British commissioners, when they arrived at Washington and had an opportunity of ascertaining the feeling that prevailed at that time, not only among the United States commissioners, but among the public men of the United States whom they met there, and from their communications with other sources of information, that the feeling was universal that all questions should be settled beyond the possibility of dispute in the future, and more especially that if, by any possibility, a solution of the difficulty respecting the fisheries could be arrived at, or a satisfactory arrangement made by which the fishery question could be placed in abeyance as in 1854, it would be to the advantage of both nations.

It must be remembered that the commission sat in 1871; that the exclusion of American fishermen from our waters was enforced and kept up during the whole of 1870; and that great and loud, though I believe unfounded, complaints had been made that American fishing-vessels had been illegally seized although they had not trespassed upon our waters. Persons interested had been using every effort to arouse and stimulate the minds of the people of the United States against Canada and the Canadian authorities, and it was felt and expressed that it would be a great bar to the chance of the treaty being accepted by the United States if one of the causes of irritation which had been occurring a few months before should be allowed to remain unsettled; collisions would occur between American fishermen claiming certain rights, and Canadians resisting those claims; that thereby unfriendly feelings would be aroused, and all the good which might be effected by the treaty would be

destroyed, by quarrels between man and man engaged on the fishing-grounds. . . .

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I felt myself powerless; and when the American commissioners made their last offer, which is now in the treaty, offering reciprocity in fisheries: that Canadians should fish in American waters, and that Americans should fish in Canadian waters; that fish and fish oil should be reciprocally free; and that if, on arbitration, it were found that the bargain was an unjust one to Canada, and Canada did not receive sufficient compensation for her fisheries by that arrangement, it was remitted to her Majesty's government to say what should be done; and, as will be seen by the last sentence of the protocol:

"The subject was further discussed in the conferences of April 18 and 19, and, the British commissioners having referred the last proposal to the government, and received instructions to accept it, the treaty articles, 18 to 25, were agreed to at the conference of April 23."

Thus, then, it occurred that these articles from 18 to 25 are portions of the treaty.. One of these articles reserves to Canada the right of adoption or rejection, and it is for this Parliament now to say whether, under all the circumstances, it should ratify or reject them.

The papers that have been laid before the House show what was the opinion of the Canadian government. Under the present circumstances of that question the Canadian government believe that it is for the interest of Canada to accept the treaty, to ratify it by legislation. They believe it is for the interest of Canada to accept it, and they are more inclined to believe it from the fact which I must say has surprised me, and surprised my colleagues, and has surprised the country,—that the portion of the treaty which was supposed to be most

unpopular and most prejudicial to the interests of the Maritime Provinces, has proved to be the least unpopular.

Sir, I could not have anticipated that the American fishermen, who were offered the advantages of fishing in our waters, would be to a man opposed to the treaty as inflicting upon them a great injury. I could not have anticipated that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, who at first expressed hostility, would now, with a few exceptions, be anxious for its adoption.

In viewing these articles of the treaty I would call the consideration of the House to the fact that their scope and aim have been greatly misrepresented by that portion of the Canadian press which is opposed to the present government. It has been alleged to be an ignominious sale of the property of Canada, a bartering away of the territorial rights of this country for money. Sir, no allegation could be more utterly unfounded than this. It is no more a transfer and sale of the territorial rights of Canada than was the treaty of 1854. The very basis of this treaty is reciprocity.

To be sure, it does not go as far and embrace as many articles as the treaty of 1852. I am sorry for it. I fought hard that it should be so, but the terms of this treaty are terms of reciprocity, and the very first clause ought to be sufficient evidence upon that point, for it declares that Canadians shall have the same right to fish in American waters that Americans will have under the treaty to fish in Canadian waters.

True it may be said that our fisheries are more valuable than theirs, but that does not affect the principle. The principle is this: that we were trying to make a reciprocity arrangement and going as far in the direction of reciprocity as possible. The principle is the same in each case, and as

regards the treaty that has been negotiated it is not confined to reciprocity in the use of the inshore fisheries of the two countries. It provides that the products of the fisheries of the two nations — fish oil as well as fish — shall be interchanged free.

The only departure from the principle of reciprocity in the present treaty is the provision that if it shall be found that Canada had made a bad bargain and had not received a fair compensation for what she gave; if it shall be found that while there was reciprocity as to the enjoyment of rights and privileges there was not true reciprocity in value, then the difference in value should be ascertained and paid to this country. Now, if there is anything approaching to the dishonorable and the degrading in these proposals, I do not know the meaning of those terms. This provision may not be one that will meet the acceptance of the country, but I say that the manner in which it has been characterized is a wilful and deliberate use of language which the parties employing it did not believe at the time to be accurate, and to which they resorted for political reasons and in order to create misapprehensions in the country. Sir, there was no humiliation. Canada would not tolerate an act of humiliation on the part of its government. England would neither advise nor permit one of her faithful colonies to be degraded and cast down.

But it is said that the American fisheries are of no value to us. They are not as valuable as ours, it is true, but still they have a substantial value for us in this way,— that the exclusion of Canadian fishermen from the American coast fisheries would have been a loss to the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces, and I will tell you why. It is quite true that the mackerel fishery, which is the most valuable fishery on these coasts, belongs chiefly to Canada, and that the

mackerel of the American coast is far inferior in every respect to the Canadian fish; but it is also true that in American waters the favorite bait to catch the mackerel with, known as the menhaden, is found, and it is so much the favorite bait that one fishing-vessel having this bait on board will draw a whole school of mackerel in the very face of vessels having an inferior bait.

Now the value of the privilege of entering American waters for catching that bait is very great. If Canadian fishermen were excluded from American waters by any combination among American fishermen or by any act of Congress, they might be deprived of getting a single ounce of the bait. American fishermen might combine for that object, or a law might be passed by Congress forbidding the exportation of menhaden; but by the provision made in the treaty Canadian fishermen are allowed to enter into American waters to procure the bait, and the consequence of that is that no such combination can exist, and Canadians can purchase the bait and be able to fish on equal terms with the Americans.

It is thus seen, sir, that this reciprocity treaty is not a mere matter of sentiment; it is a most valuable privilege, which is not to be neglected, despised, or sneered at. With respect to the language of these articles some questions have been raised and placed on the paper, and I have asked the honorable gentlemen who were about to put them to postpone doing so; and I now warn honorable members—and I do it with the most sincere desire to protect the interests of Canada—if this treaty becomes a treaty, and we ratify the fishery articles, I warn them not to raise questions which otherwise might not be raised.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no greater instance in which

a wise discretion can be used than in not suggesting any doubts. With respect, however, to the question which was put by the honorable member for the county of Charlotte,— and it is a question which might well be put, and which requires some answer,— I would state to that honorable gentleman, and I think he will be satisfied with the answer, that the treaty of 1871, in the matter his questions refer to, is larger and wider in its provisions in favor of Canada than was the treaty of 1854, and that under the treaty of 1854 no question was raised as to the exact locality of the catch, but all fish brought to the United States market by Canadian vessels were free.

I say this advisedly, and I will discuss it with the honorable gentleman whenever he may choose to give me the opportunity. The same practice will, I have no doubt, be continued under the treaty of 1871 unless the people of Canada themselves raise the objection. The warning I have just now expressed I am sure the House will take in the spirit in which it is intended. No honorable member will, of course, be prevented from exercising his own discretion, but I felt it my duty to call the attention of the House to the necessity of great prudence in not raising, needlessly, doubts as to the terms of the treaty.

It will be remembered that we have not given all our fisheries away: the treaty applies only to the fisheries of the old Province of Canada; and in order that the area should not be widened it is provided that it shall apply only to the fisheries of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, so that the treaty does not allow the Americans to have access to the Pacific coast fisheries, nor yet to the inexhaustible and priceless fisheries of the Hudson Bay. Those are great sources of revenue yet undeveloped, but after

the treaty is ratified they will develop rapidly; and in twelve years from now, when the two nations sit down to reconsider the circumstances and readjust the treaty, it will be found that other and great wealth will be at the disposal of the Dominion.

I may be asked, though I have not seen that the point has excited any observation, why were not the products of the lake fisheries laid open to both nations, and in reply I may say that these fisheries were excepted at my instance. The Canadian fisheries on the north shores of the Great Lakes are most valuable. By a judicious system of preservation and protection we have greatly increased that source of wealth. It is also known that from a concurrence of circumstances and from situation the fisheries on the south shores are not nearly so valuable as ours, and it therefore appeared that if we once allowed the American fishermen to have admission to our waters, with their various engines of destruction, all the care taken for many years to cultivate that source of wealth would be disturbed, injured, and prejudiced, and there would be no end of quarrels and dissatisfaction in our narrow waters, and no real reciprocity, and therefore that Canada would be much better off by preserving her own inland lake fisheries to herself, and have no right to enter the American market with the products of those fisheries. This was the reason why the lake fisheries were not included in this arrangement.

Now, sir, under the present circumstances of the case, the Canadian government has decided to press upon this House the policy of accepting this treaty and ratifying the fishery articles. I may be liable to the charge of injuring our case in discussing the advantages of the arrangement, because every word used by me may be quoted and used as evidence

against us hereafter. The statement has been so thrown broadcast that the arrangement is a bad one for Canada, that, in order to show to this House and the country that it is one that can be accepted, one is obliged to run the risk of his language being used before the commissioners to settle the amount of compensation as an evidence of the value of the treaty to us.

It seems to me that in looking at the treaty in a commercial point of view, and looking at the question whether it is right to accept the articles, we have to consider that interest which is most peculiarly first affected. Now, unless I am greatly misinformed, the fishing interests, with one or two exceptions for local reasons in Nova Scotia, are altogether in favor of the treaty. They are anxious to get admission of their fish into the American market; they would view with sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market; they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade and of that great industry; and I say, that being the case, if it be to the interest of the fishermen and for the advantage of that branch of the national industry, setting aside all other considerations, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. What is the fact of the case as it stands now? The only market in the world for the Canadian number one mackerel is the United States. That is their only market, and they are practically excluded from it by the present duty.

The consequence of that duty is that they are at the mercy of the American fishermen; they are made the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans. They are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans' own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value and control the American market. The great profits of the trade

are handed over to the American fishermen, or the American merchants engaged in the trade, and they profit to the loss of our own people. Let any one go down the St. Lawrence on a summer trip, as many of us do, and call from the deck of the steamer to a fisherman in his boat, and see for what a nominal price you can secure the whole of his catch; and that is from the absence of a market and from the fact of the Canadian fishermen being completely under the control of the foreigner.

With the duty off Canadian fish, the Canadian fisherman may send his fish at the right time, when he can obtain the best price, to the American market, and thus be the means of opening a profitable trade with the United States in exchange. If, therefore, it is for the advantage of the Maritime Provinces, including that portion of Quebec which is also largely interested in the fisheries, that this treaty should be ratified and that this great market should be opened to them, on what ground should we deprive them of this right? Is it not a selfish argument that the fisheries can be used as a lever in order to gain reciprocity in flour, wheat, and other cereals? Are you to shut them off from this great market in order that you may coerce the United States into giving you an extension of the reciprocal principle?

Why, Mr. Speaker, if it were a valid argument, it would be a selfish one. What would be said by the people of Ontario if the United States had offered, for their own purposes, to admit Canadian grains free, and Nova Scotia had objected, saying, "No, you shall not have that market; you must be deprived of that market forever unless we can take in our fish also; you must lose all that great advantage until we can get a market for our fish"? Apply the argument in this way and you will see how selfish it is.

But the argument has no foundation, no basis of fact, and I will show this House how. In 1854, by a strict and rigid observance of the principle of exclusion, the American fishermen were driven out of those waters. At that time the United States was free from debt and from taxation, and they had large capital invested in their fisheries. Our fisheries were then in their infancy. They were a "feeble" people, just beginning as fishermen with little capital and little skill and their operations were very restricted. I do not speak disparagingly, but in comparison with the fishermen of the United States there was an absence of capital and skill. The United States were free from taxation, they had this capital and skill, and all they wanted was our Canadian waters in which to invest that capital and exercise that skill, but how is it altered now?

Our fisheries are now no lever by which to obtain reciprocity in grain. What do the United States care for our fisheries? The American fishermen are opposed to the treaty. Those interested in the fisheries are sending petition after petition to the United States government and Congress praying that the treaty may be rejected. They say they do not want to come into our waters. The United States government has gone into this treaty with every desire to settle all possible sources of difficulty; their fishermen complain that they will suffer by it, but the United States government desires to meet us face to face, hand to hand, heart to heart, and to have an amicable settlement of all disputes. They know that they are not making political friends or gaining political strength because nearly the whole of the interest most affected by the fishery articles is against the treaty. But they desire that the ill feelings which arose during the Civil War and from the "Alabama" case should be forgotten. A feeling of friend-

ship has grown up between the nations, and it can be no other desire than to foster and encourage that feeling which dictates the agreeing to these particular articles. The United States government will simply say, Well, if you do not like these arrangements, reject them, and the consequence will be on your own head if this friendship so auspiciously commenced is at any time broken by unhappy collisions in your waters.

# PRINCE BISMARCK



TO EDUARD LEOPOLD, PRINCE VON BISMARCK, eminent Prussian statesman, the creator of German unity, was born at Schönhausen, Prussia, April 1, 1815, and died at Friedrichsruh, July 30, 1898. Of an old and distinguished family, he received his education at Göttingen, Berlin, and Greifswald, and in 1847 entered the field of politics as a member of the first Prussian Parliament, where early in his career he sided with the Conservatives. He was opposed to the assumption of the Imperial crown by the King of Prussia in 1848-49, because the offer of the dignity came from the Frankfort Parliament, and not from the German princes. When he subsequently represented Prussia at Frankfort in the Diet of the German Confederation, he steadily set himself to diminish the preponderant influence of Austria, and to organize a pro-Prussian party among the smaller German States. From 1859 to 1862 he was ambassador at St. Petersburg. Having in the latter year been made Prussian Minister of Foreign Affairs, he governed for four years in defiance of the will of the Prussian Legislature, and risked much in order to bring about the evolution of an army which should secure for Prussia the leadership of Germany. His designs were triumphantly carried out in 1866 in the war with Austria, and in 1870-71, in the war with France, and under King William he continued to govern the Fatherland as Chancellor of the German Empire and prime minister of Prussia until after the accession of the Emperor, William II. The latter, unlike his father and his grandfather, was too autoocratic to humor the old national hero, "the man of blood and iron," and so thwarted him in his policy that Bismarck resigned and retired to Friedrichsruh. He died in his eighty-fourth year, a decade after the delivery of his speech on the Army Bill, here reproduced. Though not an orator, his speeches were always strong and impressive.

## A PLEA FOR IMPERIAL ARMAMENT

IF I rise to speak to-day it is not to urge on your acceptance the measure the President has mentioned (the army appropriation). I do not feel anxious about its adoption, and I do not believe that I can do anything to increase the majority by which it will be adopted—by which it is all-important at home and abroad that it should be adopted. Gentlemen of all parties have made up their minds how they will vote, and I have the fullest confidence



BISMARCK



in the German Reichstag that it will restore our armament to the height from which we reduced it in the period between 1867 and 1882; and this not with respect to the conditions of the moment, not with regard to the apprehensions which may excite the stock exchanges and the mind of the public; but with a considerate regard for the general condition of Europe. In speaking, I will have more to say of this than of the immediate question.

I do not speak willingly, for under existing conditions a word unfortunately spoken may be ruinous, and the multiplication of words can do little to explain the situation, either to our own people or to foreigners. I speak unwillingly, but I fear that if I kept silent there would be an increase rather than a diminution of the expectations which have attached themselves to this debate, of unrest in the public mind, of the disposition to nervousness at home and abroad. The public might believe the question to be so difficult and critical that a minister for foreign affairs would not dare to touch upon it. I speak, therefore, but I can say truly that I speak with reluctance. I might limit myself to recalling expressions to which I gave utterance from this same place a year and a day ago. Little change has taken place in the situation since then. I chanced to-day on a clipping from the "Liberal Gazette," a paper which I believe stands nearer to my friend, Representative Richter, than it does to me. It pictures one difficult situation to elucidate another, but I can take only general notice of the main points there touched on, with the explanation that if the situation has since altered, it is for the better rather than for the worse.

We had then our chief apprehension because of a war which might come to us from France. Since then, one

peace-loving President has retired from administration in France, and another peace-loving President has succeeded him. It is certainly a favorable symptom that in choosing its new chief executive France has not put its hand into Pandora's box, but that we have assurance of a continuation under President Carnot of the peaceful policy represented by President Grévy. We have, moreover, other changes in the French administration whose peaceful significance is even stronger than that of the change in the presidency—an event which involved other causes. Such members of the ministry as were disposed to subordinate the peace of France and of Europe to their personal interests have been shoved out, and others, of whom we have not this to fear, have taken their places. I think I can state, also—and I do it with pleasure, because I do not wish to excite but to calm the public mind—that our relations with France are more peaceful, much less explosive than a year ago.

The fears which have been excited during the year have been occasioned more by Russia than by France, or I may say that the occasion was rather the exchange of mutual threats, excitement, reproaches, and provocations which have taken place during the summer between the Russian and the French press. But I do not believe that the situation in Russia is materially different now from what it was a year ago. The "Liberal Gazette" has printed in display type what I said then—"Our friendship with Russia sustained no interruption during our war, and it is elevated above all doubt to-day. We expect neither assault nor attack nor unfriendliness from Russia." Perhaps this was printed in large letters to make it easier to attack it. Perhaps also with the hope that I had reached a different

conclusion in the meantime and had become convinced that my confidence in the Russian policy of last year was erroneous. This is not the case. The grounds which gave occasion for it lie partly in the Russian press and partly in the mobilization of Russian troops. I cannot attach decided importance to the attitude of the press. They say that it means more in Russia than it does in France. I am of the contrary opinion. In France the press is a power which influences the conclusions of the administration. It is not such a power in Russia, nor can it be; but in both cases the press is only spots of printer's ink on paper against which we have no war to wage. There can be no ground of provocation for us in it. Behind each article is only one man—the man who has guided the pen to send the article into the world. Even in a Russian paper, we may say in an independent Russian paper, secretly supported by French subsidies, the case is not altered. The pen which has written in such a paper an article hostile to Germany has no one behind it but the man whose hand held the pen, the man who in his cabinet produced the lucubration and the protector which every Russian newspaper is wont to have—that is to say the official more or less important in Russian party politics who gives such a paper his protection. But both of them do not weigh a feather against the authority of his Majesty, the Czar of Russia. . . .

Since the great war of 1870 was concluded, has there been any year, I ask you, without its alarm of war? Just as we were returning, at the beginning of the seventies, they said: When will we have the next war? When will the Revanche be fought? In five years at latest. They said to us then: "The question of whether we will have

war and of the success with which we shall have it (it was a representative of the Centre who upbraided me with it in the Reichstag) depends to-day only on Russia. Russia alone has the decision in her hands."

Perhaps I will return to this question later. In the meantime, I will continue the pictures of these forty years and recall that in 1876 a war-cloud gathered in the South; that in 1877, the Balkan War was only prevented by the Berlin Congress from putting the whole of Europe in a blaze, and that quite suddenly after the Congress a new vision of danger was disclosed to us in the East because Russia was offended by our action at the conference. Perhaps, later on, I will recur to this also if my strength will permit.

Then followed a certain reaction in the intimate relations of the three emperors which allowed us to look for some time into the future with more assurance; yet on the first signs of uncertainty in their relations, or because of the lapsing of the agreements they had made with each other, our public opinion showed the same nervous and, I think, exaggerated excitement with which we had to contend last year—which, at the present time, I hold to be specially uncalled for. But because I think this nervousness uncalled for now, I am far from concluding that we do not need an increase of our war-footing. On the contrary! Therefore, I have unrolled before you this tableau of forty years—perhaps not to your amusement! If not, I beg your pardon, but had I omitted a year from that which you yourselves had experienced with shuddering, the impression might have been lost that the state of anxiety before wars, before continually extending complications, the entanglements of which no one can anticipate

—that this condition is permanent with us; that we must reckon upon it as a permanency; and that independently of the circumstances of the moment, with the self-confidence of a great nation which is strong enough under any circumstances to take its fate into its own hands against any coalition; with the confidence in itself and in God which its own power and the righteousness of its cause, a righteousness which the care of the government will always keep with Germany—that we shall be able to foresee every possibility and, doing so, to look forward to peace.

The long and the short of it is that in these days we must be as strong as we can; and if we will, we can be stronger than any other country of equal resources in the world. I will return to that. And it would be a crime not to use our resources. If we do not need an army prepared for war, we do not need to call for it. It depends merely on the not very important question of the cost—and it is not very important, though I mention it incidentally. I have no mind to go into figures, financial or military, but France during the last few years has spent in improving her forces three thousand millions, while we have spent hardly fifteen hundred millions including that we are now asking for. But I leave the ministers of war and of finance to deal with that. When I say that we must strive continually to be ready for all emergencies, I advance the proposition that, on account of our geographical position, we must make greater efforts than other powers would be obliged to make in view of the same ends. We lie in the middle of Europe. We have at least three fronts on which we can be attacked. France has only an eastern boundary; Russia only its western, exposed to assault. We are, moreover, more exposed than any other

people to the danger of hostile coalition because of our geographical position, and because, perhaps, of the feeble power of cohesion which, until now, the German people has exhibited when compared with others. At any rate, God has placed us in a position where our neighbors will prevent us from falling into a condition of sloth—of wallowing in the mire of mere existence. On one side of us he has set the French, a most warlike and restless nation; and he has allowed to become exaggerated in the Russians fighting tendencies which had not become apparent in them during the earlier part of the century. So we are spurred forward on both sides to endeavors which perhaps we would not make otherwise. The pikes in the European carp-pond will not allow us to become carp, because they make us feel their stings in both our sides. They force us to an effort which, perhaps, we would not make otherwise, and they force us also to a cohesion among ourselves as Germans which is opposed to our innermost nature; otherwise we would prefer to struggle with each other. But when we are enfiladed by the press of France and Russia, it compels us to stand together, and through such compression it will so increase our fitness for cohesion that we may finally come into the same condition of indivisibility which is natural to other people—which thus far we have lacked. We must respond to this dispensation of Providence, however, by making ourselves so strong that the pike can do nothing more than encourage us to exert ourselves. We had, years ago, in the times of the Holy Alliance (I recall an old American song which I learned from my dead friend, Motley,

In good old colonial times  
When we lived under a king,

We had then patriarchal times and with them a multitude of balustrades on which we could support ourselves, and a multitude of dikes to protect us from the wild European floods. That was the German confederation, and the true beginning, and continuance, and conclusion of the German confederation was the Holy Alliance, for whose service it was made. We depended on Russia and Austria, and, above everything, we relied on our own modesty, which did not allow us to speak before the rest of the company had spoken. We have lost all that, and we must help ourselves. The Holy Alliance was shipwrecked in the Crimean War—through no fault of ours! The German confederation has been destroyed by us because our existence under it was neither tolerable for us nor for the German people. Both have ceased to exist. After the dissolution of the German confederation, after the war of 1866, we would have been obliged to reckon on isolation for Prussia or North Germany, had we been obliged to stop at reckoning with the fact that, on no side would they forgive us the new and great successes which we had obtained. Never do other powers look with pleasure on the triumphs of a neighbor.

Our connection with Russia was not disturbed, however, by the events of 1866. In 1866 the memory of the polities of Count von Buol and of Austrian politics during the Crimean War was too fresh in Russia to allow them to think of supporting the Austrian against the Prussian monarchy, or of renewing the campaign which Czar Nicholas had conducted for Austria in 1849. For us, therefore, there remained a natural inclination toward Russia, which, foreseen in the last century, had in this its recognized origin in the politics of Czar Alexander I.

To him Prussia owes thanks indeed. In 1813 he could easily have turned on the Polish frontiers and concluded peace. Later he could have brought about the fall of Prussia. We have then, as a fact, to thank, for the restoration of the old footing, the goodwill of Czar Alexander I.; or, if you are inclined to be sceptical, say to the need felt in Russian politics for Prussia. This feeling of gratitude has controlled the administration of Frederick William the Third.

The balance which Russia had on its account with Prussia was used up through the friendship, I may say through the serviceability of Prussia during the entire reign of Czar Nicholas, and, I may add, settled at Olmutz. At Olmutz, Czar Nicholas did not take the part of Prussia, did not shield us from adverse experience, did not guard us against humiliation; for, on the whole, he leaned toward Austria more than toward Prussia. The idea that during his administration we owed thanks to Russia results from a historical legend. But while Czar Nicholas lived, we, on our side, did not violate the tradition with Russia. During the Crimean War, as I have already told you, we stood by Russia in spite of threats and of some hazard. His Majesty, the late king, had no desire to play a decided part in the war with a strong army, as I think he could easily have done. We had concluded treaties by which we were bound to put a hundred thousand men in the field by a set time. I advised his Majesty that we should put not a hundred thousand but two hundred thousand in the field, and to put them there *à cheval* so that we could use them right and left; so that his Majesty would have been the final arbiter of the fortunes of the Crimean War. But his late Majesty was not inclined to warlike undertakings, and the people

ought to be grateful to him for it. I was younger and less experienced then than I am now. We bore no malice for Olmutz, however, during the Crimean War. We came out of the Crimean War as a friend of Russia, and while I was ambassador to Russia I enjoyed the fruit of this friendship in a very favorable reception at court and in Russian society. Our attitude toward Austria in the Italian War was not to the taste of the Russian cabinet, but it had no unfavorable consequences. Our Austrian War of 1866 was looked upon with a certain satisfaction. No one in Russia then grudged Austria what she got. In the year 1870 we had, in taking our stand and making our defence, the satisfaction of coincidentally rendering a service to our Russian friends in the Black Sea. The opening of the Black Sea by the contracting powers would never have been probable if the Germans had not been victorious in the neighborhood of Paris. Had we been defeated, for example, I think the conclusion of the London agreement would not have been so easily in Russia's favor. So the war of 1870 left no ill humor between us and Russia. . . .

The bill will bring us an increase of troops capable of bearing arms—a possible increase, which, if we do not need it, we need not call out, but can leave the men at home. But we will have it ready for service if we have arms for it. And that is a matter of primary importance. I remember the carbine which was furnished by England to our Landwehr in 1813, and with which I had some practice as a huntsman—that was no weapon for a soldier! We can get arms suddenly for an emergency, but if we have them ready for it, then this bill will count for a strengthening of our peace forces and a reinforcement of the peace league as great as if a fourth great power had

joined the alliance with an army of seven hundred thousand men—the greatest yet put in the field.

I think, too, that this powerful reinforcement of the army will have a quieting effect on our own people, and will in some measure relieve the nervousness of our exchanges, of our press, and of our public opinion. I hope they all will be comforted if they make it clear to themselves that after this reinforcement and from the moment of the signature and publication of the bill the soldiers are there! But arms are necessary, and we must provide better ones if we wish to have an army of triarians—of the best manhood that we have among our people; of fathers of family over thirty years old! And we must give them the best arms that can be had! We must not send them into battle with what we have not thought good enough for our young troops of the line. But our steadfast men, our fathers of family, our Samsons, such as we remember seeing hold the bridge at Versailles, must have the best arms on their shoulders, and the best clothing to protect them against the weather which can be had from anywhere. We must not be niggardly in this. And I hope it will reassure our countrymen if they think now it will be the case—as I do not believe—that we are likely to be attacked on both sides at once. There is a possibility of it, for, as I have explained to you in the history of the Forty Years' War, all manner of coalitions may occur. But if it should occur we could hold the defensive on our borders with a million good soldiers. At the same time, we could hold in reserve a half million or more, almost a million, indeed; and send them forward as they were needed. Some one has said to me: "The only result of that will be that the others will increase their forces also." But they cannot.

They have long ago reached the maximum. We lowered it in 1867 because we thought that, having the North-German confederation, we could make ourselves easier and exempt men over thirty-two. In consequence our neighbors have adopted a longer term of service—many of them a twenty year term. They have a maximum as high as ours, but they cannot touch us in quality. Courage is equal in all civilized nations. The Russians or the French acquit themselves as bravely as the Germans. But our people, our seven hundred thousand men, are veterans trained in service, tried soldiers who have not yet forgotten their training. And no people in the world can touch us in this, that we have the material for officers and under-officers to command this army. That is what they cannot imitate. The whole tendency of popular education leads to that in Germany as it does in no other country. The measure of education necessary to fit an officer or under-officer to meet the demands which the soldier makes on him, exists with us to a much greater extent than with any other people. We have more material for officers and under-officers than any other country, and we have a corps of officers that no other country can approach. In this and in the excellence of our corps of under-officers, who are really the pupils of our officers' corps, lies our superiority. The course of education which fits an officer to meet the strong demands made on his position for self-denial, for the duty of comradeship, and for fulfilling the extraordinarily difficult social duties whose fulfilment is made necessary among us by the comradeship which, thank God! exists in the highest degree among officers and men without the least detriment to discipline—they cannot imitate us in that—that relationship between officers and men which, with a few unfortunate

exceptions, exists in the German army. But the exceptions confirm the rule, and so we can say that no German officer leaves his soldiers under fire, but brings them out even at the risk of his own life; while, on the other hand, no German soldier, as we know by experience, forsakes his officer.

If other armies intend to supply with officers and sub-officers as many troops as we intend to have at once, then they must educate the officers, for no untaught fool is fit to command a company, and much less is he fit to fulfil the difficult duties which an officer owes to his men, if he is to keep their love and respect. The measure of education which is demanded for that, and the qualities which, among us especially, are expressed in comradeship and sympathy by the officer—that no rule and no regulation in the world can impress on the officers of other countries. In *that* we are superior to all, and in that they cannot imitate us! On that point I have no fear.

But there is still another advantage to be derived from the adoption of this bill: The very strength for which we strive shows our peaceful disposition. That sounds paradoxical, but still it is true.

No man would attack us when we have such a powerful war-machine as we wish to make the German army. If I were to come before you to-day and say to you—supposing me to be convinced that the conditions are different from what they are—if I were to say to you: “We are strongly threatened by France and Russia; it is evident that we will be attacked; my conviction as a diplomat, considering the military necessities of the case, is that it is expedient for us to take the defensive by striking the first blow, as we are now in a position to do; an aggres-

sive war is to our advantage, and I beg the Reichstag for a milliard or half a milliard to begin it at once against both our neighbors"—indeed, gentlemen, I do not know that you would have sufficient confidence in me to consent! I hope you would not.

But if you were to do it, it would not satisfy me. If we, in Germany, should wish to wage war with the full exertion of our national strength, it must be a war with which all who engage in it, all who offer themselves as sacrifices in it—in short, the whole nation takes part as one man; it must be a people's war; it must be a war carried on with the enthusiasm of 1870, when we were ruthlessly attacked. I well remember the ear-splitting, joyful shouts at the Cologne railway station; it was the same from Berlin to Cologne; and it was the same here in Berlin. The waves of public feeling in favor of war swept us into it whether we wished or not. It must always be so if the power of a people such as ours is to be exerted to the full. It will be very difficult, however, to make it clear to the provinces and states of the confederation and to their peoples that war is now unavoidably necessary. They would ask: "Are you sure of that? Who knows?" In short, when we came to actual hostilities, the weight of such imponderable considerations would be much heavier against us than the material opposition we would meet from our enemies. "Holy Russia" would be irritated; France would bristle with bayonets as far as the Pyrenees. It would be the same everywhere. A war which was not decreed by the popular will could be carried on if once the constituted authorities had finally decided on it as a necessity; it would be carried on vigorously, and perhaps successfully, after the first fire and the sight of blood. But it would not be a finish fight in

its spirit with such fire and *élan* behind it as we would have in a war in which we were attacked. Then all Germany from Memel to Lake Constance would flame out like a powder mine; the country would bristle with arms, and no enemy would be rash enough to join issues with the *furor Teutonicus* (Berserker madness) thus roused by attack.

We must not lose sight of such considerations, even if we are now superior to our future opponents, as many military critics besides our own consider us to be. All our own critics are convinced of our superiority. Naturally every soldier believes it. He would come very near to being a failure as a soldier if he did not wish for war and feel full assurance of victory. If our rivals sometimes suspect that it is fear of the result which makes us peaceful, they are grievously in error. We believe as thoroughly in the certainty of our victory in a righteous cause as any lieutenant in a foreign garrison can believe in his third glass of champagne—and perhaps we have more ground for our assurance! It is not fear which makes us peaceable, but the consciousness of our strength—the consciousness that if we were attacked at the most unfavorable time, we are strong enough for defence and for keeping in view the possibility of leaving it to the providence of God to remove in the meantime the necessity for war.

I am never for an offensive war, and if war can come only through our initiative, it will not begin. Fire must be kindled by some one before it can burn, and we will not kindle it. Neither the consciousness of our strength, as I have just represented it, nor the trust in our alliances will prevent us from continuing with our accustomed zeal our accustomed efforts to keep the peace. We will not allow ourselves to be led by bad temper; we will not yield

to prejudice. It is undoubtedly true that the threats, the insults, the provocations which have been directed against us, have aroused great and natural animosities on our side. And it is hard to rouse such feelings in the Germans, for they are less sensitive to the dislike of others toward them than any other nation. We are taking pains, however, to soften these animosities, and in the future as in the past we will strive to keep the peace with our neighbors—especially with Russia. When I say “especially with Russia,” I mean that France offers us no security for the success of our efforts, though I will not say that it does not help. We will never seek occasion to quarrel. We will never attack France. In the many small occasions for trouble which the disposition of our neighbors to spy and to bribe has given us, we have made pleasant and amicable settlements. I would hold it grossly criminal to allow such trifles either to occasion a great national war or to make it probable. There are occasions when it is true that the “more reasonable gives way.” I name Russia especially, and I have the same confidence in the result I had a year ago when my expression gave this “Liberal” paper here occasion for black type. But I have it without running after—or, as a German paper expressed it, “grovelling before Russia.” That time has gone by. We no longer sue for favor, either in France or in Russia. The Russian press and Russian public opinion have shown the door to an old, powerful, and attached friend as we were. We will not force ourselves upon them. We have sought to regain the old confidential relationship, but we will run after no one. But that does not prevent us from observing—it rather spurs us on to observe with redoubled care—the treaty rights of Russia. Among these treaty rights are some which are not con-

ceded by all our friends: I mean the rights which at the Berlin Congress Russia won in the matter of Bulgaria. . . .

In consequence of the resolution of the Congress, Russia, up to 1885, chose as prince a near relative of the Czar, concerning whom no one asserted or could assert that he was anything else than a Russian dependant. It appointed the minister of war and a greater part of the officials. In short, it governed Bulgaria. There is no possible doubt of it. The Bulgarians, or a part of them, or their prince—I do not know which—were not satisfied. There was a *coup d'état*, and there has been a defection from Russia. This has created a situation which we have no call to change by force of arms—though its existence does not change theoretically the rights which Russia gained from the conference. But if Russia should seek to establish its rights forcibly I do not know what difficulties might arise, and it does not concern us to know. We will not support forcible measures and will not advise them. I do not believe there is any disposition toward them. I am sure no such inclination exists. But if through diplomatic means, through the intervention of the Sultan as the suzerain of Bulgaria, Russia seeks its rights, then I assume that it is the province of loyal German statesmanship to give an unmistakable support to the provisions of the Berlin Treaty, and to stand by the interpretation which without exception we gave it—an interpretation on which the voice of the Bulgarians cannot make me err. Bulgaria, the Statelet between the Danube and the Balkans, is certainly not of sufficient importance to justify plunging Europe into war from Moscow to the Pyrenees, from the North Sea to Palermo—a war the issue of which no one could foresee, at the end of which no one could tell what the fighting had been about.

So I can say openly that the position of the Russian press, the unfriendliness we have experienced from Russian public opinion, will not prevent us from supporting Russia in a diplomatic attempt to establish its rights as soon as it makes up its mind to assert them in Bulgaria. I say deliberately—"As soon as Russia expresses the wish." We have put ourselves to some trouble heretofore to meet the views of Russia on the strength of reliable hints, but we have lived to see the Russian press attacking, as hostile to Russia, the very things in German politics which were prompted by a desire to anticipate Russia's wishes. We did that at the Congress, but it will not happen again. If Russia officially asks us to support measures for the restoration in Bulgaria of the situation approved by the Congress with the Sultan as suzerain, I would not hesitate to advise his Majesty, the Emperor, that it should be done. This is the demand which the treaties make on our loyalty to a neighbor, with whom, be the mood what it will, we have to maintain neighborly relations and defend great common interests of monarchy, such as the interests of order against its antagonists in all Europe, with a neighbor, I say, whose sovereign has a perfect understanding in this regard with the allied sovereigns. I do not doubt that when the Czar of Russia finds that the interests of his great empire of a hundred million people require war, he will make war. But his interests cannot possibly prompt him to make war against us. I do not think it at all probable that such a question of interest is likely to present itself. I do not believe that a disturbance of the peace is imminent—if I may recapitulate—and I beg that you will consider the pending measure without regard to that thought or that apprehension, looking on it rather

as a full restoration of the mighty power which God has created in the German people—a power to be used if we need it! If we do not need it, we will not use it and we will seek to avoid the necessity for its use. This attempt is made somewhat more difficult by threatening articles in foreign newspapers, and I may give special admonition to the outside world against the continuance of such articles. They lead to nothing. The threats made against us, not by the government but in the newspapers, are incredibly stupid, when it is remembered that they assume that a great and proud power such as the German Empire is capable of being intimidated by an array of black spots made by a printer on paper, a mere marshalling of words. If they would give up that idea, we could reach a better understanding with both our neighbors. Every country is finally answerable for the wanton mischief done by its newspapers, and the reckoning is liable to be presented some day in the shape of a final decision from some other country. We can be bribed very easily—perhaps too easily—with love and goodwill. But with threats, never!

We Germans fear God, and nothing else in the world!

It is the fear of God which makes us love peace and keep it. He who breaks it against us ruthlessly will learn the meaning of the warlike love of the Fatherland which in 1813 rallied to the standard the entire population of the then small and weak kingdom of Prussia; he will learn, too, that this patriotism is now the common property of the entire German nation, so that whoever attacks Germany will find it unified in arms, every warrior having in his heart the steadfast faith that God will be with us.

AGAINST LIBERALISM: A PRUSSIAN ROYALIST  
CONFESION OF FAITH

DELIVERED JUNE 1, 1847

I WILL not take the trouble to examine the solidity of the various grounds of right, on which each of us presumes himself to stand; but, I believe, it has become certain, from the debate and from everything which I have gathered from the discussion of the question, that a different construction and interpretation of the older estates legislation was possible and practically existent — not among laymen only, but also among weighty jurists — and that it would be very doubtful what a court of justice, if such a question were before it, would decree concerning it. Under such circumstances, the declaration would, according to general principles of law, afford a solution.

This declaration has become implicit upon us, implicit by the patent of the third of February of this year; by this the King has declared that the general promises of former laws have been no other than those fulfilled by the present law. It appears that this declaration has been regarded by a portion of this assembly as inaccurate, but such is a fate to which every declaration is equally subject. Every declaration is considered by those whose opinions it does not confirm, to be wrong, or the previous conviction could not have been sincere. The question really is, in whom the right resides to issue an authentic and legally binding declaration. In my opinion, the King alone; and this conviction, I believe, lies in the conscience of the people. For when yesterday an honorable deputy from Königsberg asserted that

there was a dull dissatisfaction among the people on the proclamation of the patent of the third of February, I must reply, on the contrary, that I do not find the majority of the Prussian nation represented in the meetings which take place in the Böttchershöfchen. (Murmurs.)

In inarticulate sounds I really cannot discover any refutation of what I have said, nor do I find it in the goose-quills of the newspaper correspondents; no! not even in a fraction of the population of some of the large provincial towns. It is difficult to ascertain public opinion; I think I find it in some of the middle provinces, and it is the old Prussian conviction that a royal word is worth more than all the constructions and quirks applied to the letter of the law.

Yesterday a parallel was drawn between the method employed by the English people in 1688, after the abdication of James II, for the preservation of its rights, and that by which the Prussian nation should now attain a similar end. There is always something suspicious in parallels with foreign countries. Russia had been held up to us as a model of religious toleration; the French and Danish exchequers have been recommended as examples of proper finances.

To return to the year 1688 in England, I must really beg this august assembly, and especially an honorable deputy from Silesia, to pardon me if I again speak of a circumstance which I did not personally perceive. The English people was then in a different position to that of the Prussian people now; a century of revolution and civil war had invested it with the right to dispose of a crown, and bind up with it conditions accepted by William of Orange.

On the other hand, the Prussian sovereigns were in possession of a crown, not by grace of the people, but by God's

grace; an actually unconditional crown, some of the rights of which they voluntarily conceded to the people — an example rare in history. I will leave the question of right, and proceed to that concerning the utility and desirability of asking or suggesting any change in the legislation as it actually now exists. I adhere to the conviction, which I assume to be that of the majority of the assembly, that periodicity is necessary to a real vitality of this assembly; but it is another matter whether we should seek this by way of petition. Since the emanation of the patent of the third of February, I do not believe that it would be consonant with the royal pleasure, or that it is inherent with the position of ourselves as estates, to approach his Majesty already with a petition for an amendment of it.

At any rate let us allow the grass of this summer to grow over it. The King has repeatedly said, that he did not wish to be coerced and driven; but I ask the assembly what should we be doing otherwise than coercing and driving him, if we already approached the throne with requests for changes in the legislation?

To the gravity of this view I ask permission of the assembly to add another reason. It is certainly well known how many sad predictions have been made by the opponents of our polity connected with the fact that the government would find itself forced by the estates into a position which it would not have willingly taken up. But although I do not assume the government would allow itself to be coerced, I still think that it is in the interests of the government to avoid the slightest trace of unwillingness as to concessions, and that it is in all our interests not to concede to the enemies of Prussia the delight of witnessing the fact that, by a petition — a vote — presented by us as the representatives

of sixteen millions of subjects, we should throw a shade of unwillingness upon such a concession.

It has been said that his Majesty, the King, and the commissioner of the diet have themselves pointed out this path. For myself, I could not otherwise understand this than that, as the King has done, so also the commissioner of the diet indicated this as the legal way we should pursue in case we found ourselves aggrieved; but that it would be acceptable to his Majesty, the King, and the government that we should make use of this right, I have not been able to perceive. If, however, we did so, it would be believed that urgent grounds existed for it—that there was immediate danger in the future; but of this I cannot convince myself. The next session of the assembly is assured; the Crown, also, is thereby in the advantageous position, that within four years, or even a shorter period, it can with perfect voluntariness, and without asking, take the initiative as to that which is now desired.

Now, I ask, is not the edifice of our State firmer toward foreign countries?—will not the feeling of satisfaction be greater at home, if the continuation of our national polity be inaugurated by the initiative of the Crown, than by petition from ourselves? Should the Crown not find it good to take the initiative, no time is lost. The third diet will not follow so rapidly upon the second, that the King would have no time to reply to a petition presented under such circumstances by the second. Yesterday a deputy from Prussia—I think from the circle of Neustadt—uttered a speech which I could only comprehend as meaning that it was our interest to pull up the flower of confidence as a weed preventing us from seeing the bare ground, and cast it out.

I say with pride that I cannot agree with such an opinion.

If I look back for ten years, and compare that which was written and said in the year 1837 with that which is proclaimed from the steps of the throne to the whole nation, I believe we have great reason to have confidence in the intentions of his Majesty. In this confidence I beg to recommend this august assembly to adopt the amendment of the honorable deputy from Westphalia — not that of the honorable deputy from the county of Mark — but that of Herr von Lilien.

# ANDREW G. CURTIN



ANDREW GREGG CURTIN, American statesman and diplomat, and Governor of Pennsylvania (1861-67), was born at Bellefonte, Pa., April 22, 1817, and died there Oct. 7, 1894. He obtained his education at Milton Academy, after which he studied law at Dickinson College, was admitted to the Bar in 1839, and beginning to practice in his native county, soon attained prominence in his profession. Engaging in politics as a Whig, he was an active worker for Harrison in 1840, and four years later canvassed the State for Henry Clay. In 1854, he was appointed secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and ex-officio superintendent of common schools, in which post he did much to further education and reform the school system of the State. It was his report to the legislature, in 1855, that led to the establishment of normal schools. In 1860, he was elected Republican Governor of Pennsylvania and in his inaugural he advocated suppression by force of Secession. When the call for troops was made by the President, in April, 1861, Curtin responded with alacrity, companies of soldiers sent by him reaching Washington, April 18, these being the first volunteer troops to reach the capital. By his direction, 15,000 additional volunteers were held in readiness at Harrisburg. Their services were shortly after accepted by the government, and Governor Curtin continued this patriotic activity throughout the period of the Civil War. After serving as Governor a second term, he retired for a while to private life, but from 1868 to 1872 was minister to Russia. On his return to the United States he supported Greeley for the Presidency, and since then allied himself with the Democratic party. In 1881, he entered Congress as Democratic representative and served until 1887 through two successive terms.

## THE PEOPLE'S HERITAGE SQUANDERED

[The House having under consideration the bill to repeal section 22 of the act to incorporate the Texas Pacific Railroad Company, approved March 3, 1878, and to declare the forfeiture of the land grant therein made, and for other purposes, Mr. Curtin said, June 26, 1884 :]

**M**R. SPEAKER,—No American citizen can be insensible to the great benefits conferred on the trade, commerce, and advancement of all the material interests of this country by railroads. It would have been better for the railroads and those who invest money in them, infinitely better for the people who travel and transport

goods over them, if they had been confined to the common and statute law as common carriers only. I cannot but believe that the immunities and powers given to our railroad system beyond the rights and powers of common carriers, by water and other means of transportation, would have been infinitely better for them and for the country. But the legislation of this country in the States and by the Congress of the United States in its wisdom has conferred upon railroad companies powers far beyond the purposes for which they may be equally useful to the people and at the same time not oppressive in their exactions.

Mr. Speaker, it was generous, nay it was patriotic, in the States owning vast domains in the West to give to this people lands to which they had a perfect title and which they generously surrendered for the national good. It was an inspiration of American statesmanship that led Jefferson to purchase Louisiana and the vast territories included in the purchase; and in the war with Mexico this great people conquered and gave to the public still more lands. For seventy-five years the lands given to this country were held in sacred trust for the people, to make homes for the homeless and to give lands to the landless.

Fifty-three millions of acres, sir, were given to the States for internal communications, for the advancement of trade and commerce, the settlement of the States, and for the purpose of education. Two hundred millions of acres have been voted to railroad corporations. In 1862 the Congress of the United States passed a law known as the Homestead Law. That, sir, was beneficent and generous legislation. It gave to the overflow of population in the Atlantic States a welcome to a home and a title to land where the American freeman could settle, turn the virgin soil to the light of the

sun, and build upon it a home for himself and his family, and in the fulness of time acquire by his residence a fee-simple title. From 1861 until 1874 these unprecedented and munificent gifts were made to railroad corporations. Since 1874, when the change occurred in the majority of the House, not one acre has been given away, and not one land grant has been revived or extended.

Corporations are almost a necessity, and vast benefits have arisen from such grants and the work accomplished through them, but of immeasurably more value are the lands to the people of this Republic. I repeat, sir, that from 1874 to this time not one acre of land has been given to a corporation and not one grant that has lapsed by reason of the failure on the part of the corporations to comply with its conditions has been revived or extended beyond the time of its limitations.

I must not be understood, sir, to intimate for an instant that this great government should not be held to its contracts, bad as they were in the beginning. "Keep thy covenant proclaimed upon the plains of Mesopotamia so long since in the dark past" applies to individuals as well as to governments and people, and is a safe rule of conduct for all humanity; and where our government has made a contract let us fulfil it to the letter, but do not let the gift of this great government and people be revived into life by management or artifice.

There runs through this entire bill the clearest evidence of management by individuals to take a million of acres of land which should have been dedicated to the people as their homes when they acquire title under the Homestead Law.

This government can be strong and the Republic maintained in its strength only by the occupancy of land by the

holders of small property. History is philosophy teaching by example; and tell me in all the line of history where a government republican in form has existed where a few people owned the land and the masses were serfs or peons or small tenants. All the roads of the empire lead to Rome is the boast of history. Armies marched from Rome to conquer and pillage foreign countries. They brought to Rome wealth and power, producing centralization, and too much of the immorality they found in Asiatic countries. Such was the centralization in that great republic that at last a few people, rich and powerful, owned all the lands of the country.

A distinguished citizen of Rome returning from foreign service found upon the slopes of the Alps, in Tuscany and Lombardy, where the Roman law should have given the soldiers one fourth of the lands, one fourth reserved to the state to be sold and the money returned to its treasury, one half to be given to the Roman freemen for homes. Tiberius Gracchus found in all the provinces on the slopes of the Alps scarcely one Roman freeman who owned an acre of land. Returning to Rome, as the tribune of the people, he introduced a law, and in it was generous to the rich patricians.

There were political rings at that time in Rome as there are unfortunately in this country at the present day. The rich and the powerful had their following of henchmen and servitors, and when the law was proposed by Gracchus he made it generous to the patricians, as it provided that they should be paid for the homes by the freemen who had been deprived of them. It was a just, a generous, and a liberal offer. It was just to the patricians; it was equally just to the people; but the rich and the powerful would not accept his generous offer. From the tribune they followed him

through the streets of Rome, clubbed and stoned him to death, and threw his body into the Tiber.

Then, sir, equality and liberty commenced to decay and darkness fell upon the civilized world; learning fled to the cloisters; in their ignorance rulers could not even sign their names to their decrees. There was anarchy and pillage and wrong and oppression throughout the civilized world.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that history teaches by example. We can look back and gather wisdom from the events of the past, but who will claim power to look forward and anticipate what is in the future? That condition of the Roman republic has not failed to interest friends of humanity from that time to this.

At the beginning of the French revolution, when France was entering upon revolution and the people struggling for the right to be relieved from oppression, when the exactions of tyrannical landlords had robbed them of all their just rights, reduced to poverty and frenzied by oppression the French people rose in their majesty, and in their struggle for their just rights convulsed the commerce and trade and civilization of the world for fifteen years. But in the end the domain was taken from the church and state and France was divided into small estates by purchase.

There are 10,000,000 property-owners in France to-day, with a population of 37,000,000. There are less than 4,500,000 in this land of liberty with its population of 55,000,000. At that fearful era in the history of the world, Mirabeau, who was a real friend of humanity, uttered from the tribune in the States-General words of wisdom and eloquence:—

“Thus,” said he, “perished the last of the Gracchi by the hands of the patricians, who, having received the mortal

blow, flung a handful of dust toward heaven attesting the avenging gods, and from this dust rose Marius — Marius less great in having exterminated the Cimbri than in having quelled in Rome the aristocracy of the nobility."

There were never words more sublime in sentiment or more beautiful in rhetoric uttered in the classic age. Burke was never grander in the British Commons or our own Webster in the Senate. And, sir, mark the conclusion — the beauty of the prophecy and the purity of the philosophy: "Privileges," said Mirabeau, "must have an end — the people is eternal." The wisdom of that prophecy and philosophy is not unprofitable in this discussion.

And now, Mr. Speaker, without proposing to speak of the details of this bill, I must refer to it in general terms, as gentlemen on both sides have given all the data necessary for a proper conclusion. I have, sir, the most profound respect for the chairman of the committee on the judiciary for his learning, his integrity, and his patriotism, and yet I find in his bill, as expounded upon the one side and the other, that this land is to be taken from the people by artifice and not by fair dealing. Old charters are revived, life is given worn-out and fanciful grants, and with apparent attempt by indirection to revive a munificent grant of this government. There is running through the entire bill evidences of the want of title and covenant, surely things of interest to this people.

It was the intention of the American people to enjoy this rich heritage given to them by the States and held in trust by the federal government for so many years. If there be no doubt on this subject, the covenant of the government binds it. Let this question go to the courts, where my learned friend, the chairman of the judiciary committee, can be

heard and the legal and just rights of the parties can be fairly adjudged.

This is scarcely a question for a popular assembly. This is not the place to decide a question serious as the one under consideration. We perform our duty by maintaining that the grant has lapsed by the failure of the corporations to perform the covenant they made. This question can be settled by the calm deliberation of the courts provided by the constitution. When the court sits upon the question involving the rights of American freemen I trust, sir, the judges will put on ermine that will be spotless. And if the courts decide that the contract with the companies is of such character and requires this means for its fulfilment, I say the American people will bow in submission to the decision. I repeat, "Keep thy covenant;" but if the court should find that there is management and artifice and indirection in the attempt to acquire title to this land, then decree back to the people of this country the lands that belong to them.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of money invested in railroad corporations in the United States is upward of \$7,000,000,000 and that does not include the land granted by Congress. In contrast to that the taxable property in the United States is something more than \$17,000,000,000, not including the property free from taxation by this government and many of the States. Of the 200,000 miles of railroad in the world we have 120,000 in the United States; we are grid-ironed with railroads.

Who is sensible to the fact that they have advanced the national power and consequence and contributed to the ease and comfort and happiness of our people, united jarring interests, afforded facilities for the interchange of commodi-

ties, promoted trade and commerce and the social intercourse of our people?

If the railroad system of the United States prior to 1860 had extended their lines to the south, instead of the west, on the isothermal lines, I doubt if we would ever have had that terrible and unhappy war in which so many of our people perished and which left so large a part of our rich country in poverty.

It is fortunate for this country that the vast amount of capital invested in railroads and the enormous wealth of the few men who own most of the capital stock cannot combine together and make common cause in the government of this country. The citizens who control the railroads of this country are generally enlightened men. They know too well the value of this government in the protection of their interests to attempt such a thing. If they should combine they could control this government and mold its destinies for the future. They could say who should sit in this chamber and in the august body at the other end of the Capitol, and what citizen should occupy the palatial residence at the other end of the avenue; and who should be upon the benches of the courts; and, if united, with their vast power they could say who should compose the court of last resort of the American citizen, a court that has power to interpret laws, a tribunal that in power and influence is to the individual American citizen next to his God.


Who would be the keeper of an insane asylum if the inmates could combine; who would undertake the task? But, sir, they cannot combine because reason is dethroned and the inmates madmen; nor can the railroad companies combine to dominate this country by their wealth, the number of people connected with them, or their power. Ambi-

tion, rivalry stands in the way of their combination, and as yet there is a degree of patriotism which to an extent controls those in the management of the railroads and the vast capital invested in them.

But, sir, it might come in the future; and while it is scarcely proper to expect such a calamity, there is a time when it is fair to object to a combination such as is presented in this bill enriching railroads with lands which should be taken back and given to actual settlers under the beneficent legislation of our country to soldiers who so gallantly served it in its great peril.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the 200,000,000 acres given to corporations would make seven States like Pennsylvania, and the gift of this vast domain to railroads can scarcely be said to make your country strong. I read in a newspaper that a syndicate of a railroad corporation had in the West 10,000 acres of wheat. I presume that two hundred men could put the seed in the ground and reap and garner it with the modern machinery used in husbandry. Ten or fifteen men could watch and care for this great farm during the winter; but what becomes of those not so employed? Where do they go? Their homes are not there, nor can they settle upon lands. Thrown out of employment they must become what are known in this country as "tramps," and the man who would work for a living if he could get employment is remitted to the highway and to want. Under the ragged clothes of a man called a tramp there may beat a heart as faithful to the government as yours, and no man with proper feeling will refuse a crust of bread to hungry humanity thrown out of work and cast upon cold charity, even though he be called by the opprobrious name of tramp. . . .

I cannot but think it will be better for this country to be



in the hands of small land-owners, especially when as at present power is so centralized in this federal city, and when the jurisdiction of the courts of the national government has been so extended that the people scarcely find a settlement of their rights of property and person in the State courts. Why, sir, I can remember when the American citizen no more felt the power of the federal courts than the air he breathed. When money is centralized in the hands of a few, when a few men dominate and control the business of the country, I tremble, sir, for its liberties and wonder if monopolists shall be allowed to shape its future.

The authorized permit of the government, by statute, and arbitrary assumption if enlarged will, in time, absorb the States and their sovereignty, and the pernicious anti-republican and despotic espionage, under which internal revenue is collected, may be extended to all departments of the government.

Twenty-five million acres of land were recently purchased by foreign people in one body, it is said, by some reports, by fraud. I learned last September in California that an English and Scotch company had purchased a vast tract of the red timber land of that State likely to become of great value and not too much of it to monopolize. I know full well, Mr. Speaker, that if you divide the property of this country it could not remain divided. Every one who has a sense of justice in his soul but would look with horror upon the division of property as an act of communism and socialism. To divide would place the idle and the vicious on a level with the intelligent and industrious. From the former it would soon pass away and the balance would be restored. In addition, the absence of all laws of primogeniture is the surest protection against the accumulation of vast landed estates.

To expect that every man should have a home of his own and a part of the land would be Utopian. It would be a dream, and such dreams would be dissipated by the waking senses which come to us in teaching the actual and not the ideal.

But there is a measure of conservatism which should protect the industrious pursuits of the masses of the world. Lands having been given to corporations, if they have not fulfilled their contracts, it is the highest duty of this Congress to forfeit their contracts and take the lands back and fulfil their pledges with the people, made long before the legislation which gave them these vast properties. The citizens of the United States should have these lands for homes, and the government should regard these as sacred trusts.

Mr. Speaker, I view the future of this country with hope, and I have never believed the corporations could control its destinies. As I have said, they cannot combine to control it; but no one can be insensible to the vast power in the hands of a privileged class, and of the influence they have in the legislation of Congress and of the States. It is an unfortunate fact that men are willing to do as a corporation what they would scorn to do as individuals, and they too often forget in the parlor of a corporation the code of morality that governs them as individuals.

At the beginning of the French revolution in 1790 there were issued 9,000,000,000 of assignats, founded upon the public domain, from which it may be estimated how much of that country was held by the governing classes.

The issue of the assignats was a financial experiment and failed. Then came the revolution, and from it the restoration of the land of the country from the State and church to the people by purchase, and from that time France has been divided into small properties. But two nations in the world

could have paid the exactions which were made on France at the end of the war with Germany. France is one; the United States is the other. England could not have paid it. England is owned by a small portion of her people. I have a sincere belief that France will remain a republic, and chiefly from the number of small proprietors.

Our government made these vast concessions, and has also covenants with the people, as it held these lands in trust for their use and benefit. A code of morality that applies to individuals which cannot be applied equally to the government is a fraud and a delusion.

But, sir, the government should be held strictly to the letter of the law, and the people will sustain any such legislation, but beyond that not one step. No part of the lands granted that have been forfeited by the failure to perform the covenants on the part of the companies should remain in their hands one day. And it must be considered as the settled policy of this government that no more of the public domain will be given to corporations.

My time is nearly exhausted, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps there is little more to say on this question. It cannot fail to be noticed with great satisfaction that at a recent national convention there was a declaration made against the importation of foreign laborers by corporations. How wonderfully elastic political opinion is in this country! Its views are as variable and changing as the colors of the kaleidoscope. Why, here in this book upon my desk is a statute passed in 1864, under which foreign labor could be imported, and which expressly provided that the imported man could be mortgaged and held in bondage for a year, and if he built a house his house and land could be sold by summary process on the contract made with him. At that time the war was

raging. To give more accommodation and encouragement to these people, it was declared that they should not be subject to military duty. That statute bears date the 4th of July. It is rather remarkable that the birthday of freedom and liberty and equality should be selected on which to sign such a law. That law was afterward repealed, and did not long di grace our statute-book.

And now, sir, waking after a long period of inexcusable indifference, the convention at Chicago has declared against any such legislation — in fact for the enactment of such legislation as is necessary to prevent it. During the last Congress the passage of the Chinese bill was steadily resisted upon this floor. The bill first passed was sent back with a veto by the President, and it is a notorious fact that every voice raised on this floor and every vote cast against the bill of this session to make that law effectual was by Republican members, whose convention declares for the policy they have opposed; and who, sir, knows what will be the fate of that bill in the august chamber at the other end of the Capitol, controlled as it is by the political friends of the gentlemen on the other side?

It was my good fortune to be here when the first Chinese bill was passed; and it was my privilege to raise my voice and cast my vote for it; and doubtless the convention soon to meet at Chicago will speak with no uncertain sound on this important question. Too many have already been imported, too many are here now; they interfere with the labor of the American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, what becomes of your tariff and revenue laws? They are questions that can be settled in the future; if they are not correct they can be corrected, and the wisdom is here to do it. They are questions that can be settled in

accordance with the constant change of industrial conditions and require legislation adapted to these conditions. There is no man of sufficient wisdom to anticipate what the economical and financial necessities of this great people will require. Congress is here to attend to that; to legislate for their interests and their wants.

But the question of giving away the lands, the inheritance of the people, cannot be decided by the platform of a national convention. We have the right in this country now, or if not now in the near future, to say who shall come to this country and who shall not come, and we will not permit corporate wealth and power, either foreign or domestic, to control this country and dominate its destinies by the importation of such labor as has been imported within the last two or three years. In the district I have the honor to represent large numbers of Italians, Hungarians, and Bulgarians have been imported. They do not assimilate with our people, and never can any more than the Chinese. They interfere with our own citizens who labor, native and naturalized, and take from them their legitimate employment.

There is no question that should appeal more strongly to the statesman, philanthropist, and patriot than the condition of the laborers of this country. The wonderful skill and ingenuity of the American people has wrought such marvellous improvement in labor-saving machinery, that it, in a large measure, does the work of man, until the hand of the skilled mechanic is rarely found, and there is an overproduction, and there can scarcely be said to be employment for the labor of this country; if not now that time can be anticipated in the near future. Now, if there is any power for us to legislate so as to protect American labor, it is a duty we owe to the people to do so. And we can do it on this ques-

tion, for I cannot but believe that if the public lands had been reserved for the purpose for which they were intended, and that the crowded population of the east could go west and find homes there, great good would be done. We are growing in population, and the lands now illegally held by corporations under grants that have been forfeited or being acquired in vast tracts by foreign capitalists, would afford in the future, homes for millions of American freemen.

Let us return, then, to the original condition of things, before that terrible war separated us, making the South poor, and blistering the morality of the North; let us return to the principles of the founders of this government; let us accept the constitution and laws, and live up to them; let us keep our covenant and require the fulfilment of the covenant with us; let us be faithful to our trust; and above all things let liberty and justice, equality, concord, and fraternity prevail.

# JOHN A. BINGHAM



JOHN A. BINGHAM, American politician, diplomat, orator, and judge, was born at Mercer, Pa., of Scotch-Irish stock, Jan. 21, 1815, and died at Cadiz, O., March 19, 1900. He graduated at Franklin College, and, after being admitted to the Bar, removed in 1840 to Cadiz, O. In 1854, he was elected to Congress, where he served with the intermission of one term for eighteen years. In 1864, he was appointed judge-advocate-general, and shortly after became solicitor of the United States court of claims. On the assassination of Lincoln, whose personal friend he was, Judge Bingham was summoned to Washington to investigate that crime, and immediately opened an office and concerted plans which led to the arrest, trial, and conviction of the conspirators. President Johnson appointed him special judge-advocate, and the work of examining and cross-examining the witnesses fell largely to his share. His argument for the prosecution occupied nine hours in delivery. He was a member of the committee that drew up the articles of impeachment of President Johnson, and, as chairman, made the closing argument before the Senate, which held a large audience for three successive days. His most important work, during his thirty years of public service, was the preparing and introducing of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution. He won his chief fame as an orator, his most famous speeches advocating respect for national honor and national justice. From 1873 to 1885 he was United States Minister at Tokio, Japan.

## SPEECH ON THE SECTIONAL PARTY

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, APRIL 24, 1860

M. R. CHAIRMAN.—The annual message of the President of the United States, which has been referred to this committee for its consideration, should not be passed over lightly. It contains much that, in my judgment, is offensive to the people and injurious to their interests, and which should not be allowed to go to the country unchallenged. It is my purpose, sir, to speak of this paper with all the respect that is due to the distinguished position of its author, but with the utmost freedom and candor. I speak to-day as a representative of the people and for the people;

not as the representative of party or for party. I speak to-day as an American citizen, claiming every State and section and road of the Republic as part of my native country, that country which at last has but one constitution and one destiny. I do not intend, in anything I may this day utter, to do injustice to any section of that country, or to any of its interests.

The President of the United States, in this paper, invokes all good citizens to strive to allay "the demon spirit of sectional hatred and strife now alive in the land." This sectional spirit, to which the President refers, manifested itself upon this floor during the first two months of this session. It found fit, fierce, and expressive utterance on the other side of this chamber amongst the avowed political friends of the President himself, in their attempt to arraign and condemn sixty of their peers here as the aiders and inciters of treason, insurrection, and murder; and this, too, without giving to the accused a hearing, without testimony, in defiance of all law, and without subjecting the conscience of these self-constituted triers to the inconvenient obligation of an official oath. While these gentlemen were thus attempting to enforce mob law on this floor, they were loud in proclaiming that the inauguration of a Republican President, elected by the people in conformity with the constitution and laws, should be resisted to the extremity of disunion and civil war.

These were the enunciations with which our ears were greeted for two months, pending the contest for the organization of this House. If it was fit that the President should rebuke this sectional spirit among the people, it is fit that its manifestations upon this floor should be rebuked as well; and it is eminently fit that the sectional policy of the President and of his party should be rebuked in return by the

whole people. There is so much in the tone of this paper that is intensely sectional, that I am constrained to believe that the President's plaintive invocation to allay "the demon spirit" was but smooth dissimulation, the better to disguise the sectional policy of himself and his party.

Sir, to put down forever this sectional party; to put an end forever to this sectional strife, and sectional innovation upon the constitution and the rights of the people, I am ready to join hands with good men in every section of the Union. That is a fell spirit, a demon spirit, which, under any pretence or for any purpose, would strike down all the defences of law; would sweep away all the landmarks of right and justice; would break down the traditional policy of this government, as wise as it is beneficent; which, instead of maintaining and perpetuating peace between every section of this country, would inaugurate and perpetuate discord, which would fill this goodly land with the lurid light of civil war; which would give its peaceful homes to conflagration, and its citizens to the sword; staining the white raiment of its mountains and the green vesture of its plains with the blood of human sacrifice shed in that unnatural and unmatched atrocity, fraternal strife.

Notwithstanding all I have heard, sir, upon this floor, of threats of disunion and civil war, I do not fear it; for there is in this land a power stronger than armies — that new power, born of the enlightened intellect and conscience of the people — the power of public opinion. That power speaks to-day, through the pen and the press, the living voice and the silent ballot. That power is stronger, I repeat, than armies. No, sir; notwithstanding all these threats, there can be no conflict of arms between the great sections of this Union. This land, consecrated to freedom and to man, by

the blood of patriots and of martyrs, would refuse to bear up upon its holy ground an army of traitors. Local rebellions there may be; but in the future, as in the past, they will be suppressed by the popular will; by that majestic voice of the nation, at whose lightest word the tumult of the mob is still, and the wild, stormy sea of human passion is calm. God is not in the whirlwind, nor in the earthquake, nor in the storm.

The question to-day is, not how shall civil war between the great sections of this Union be averted — for that is not to be, it is an impossibility — but the question of to-day is, how shall this sectional party and this sectional strife be allayed? I answer, sir, that this sectional strife will never be allayed by imitating the example, or adopting the policy of the President and his party; never, while there is an honest head or an honest heart in this land. Neither will this sectional strife be allayed, but fostered, rather, by the attempt, here or elsewhere, either by national or by State legislation, to enact sedition laws, by which to fetter the conscience, or stifle the convictions of American citizens. This sectional strife will never be allayed by the attempt, here or elsewhere, either by national or by State legislation, to annul the sacred right of domicile, to make it a felony for any freeman, born anywhere within the limits of the Republic, to live unmolested on the spot of his origin, so long as he behaves himself well, and it pleases God to let him live.

This sectional strife never will be allayed by the attempt to nationalize chattel slavery, to place it under the shelter of the federal constitution, and to maintain it in all the national domain, either by force of a congressional slave code, which the President recommends in this message, or by

force of Territorial legislation, enacted by virtue of congressional grants of power.

Sir, it is in such legislation as I have named, or in the attempt to inaugurate such legislation, that the President's party, sometimes misnamed the Democratic party, lives, and moves, and has its being. The time was, at the organization of this government, when it was conceded by every State and every great statesman in the land, that it was the right and the duty of the federal government to exclude slave labor and chattel slavery from every rood of the national domain, and to protect the free labor of freemen, not only in the Territories of the United States, but in every State of the Union, north, south, east and west, and wherever the jurisdiction of the government extended, either on the land or the sea.

In that day, sir, the grand words of the constitution, "to establish justice, to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," were not denounced as "glittering generalities," or the utterances of "infant philosophers;" but were reverently held, believed in, and acted upon, as absolute verities. Then, sir, to promote the general welfare Congress — the First Congress — legislated for the greatest good of the greatest number, by protecting the free labor of the whole country; and to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty, that Congress re-enacted the ordinance of 1787 (which had ceased with the confederation to be law), for the government of all the national territory; declaring thereby that no person therein should ever be enslaved, except for crime; or be deprived of life or liberty, but by due process of law and the judgment of his peers; nor of his property the product of his toil, without just compensation. Under the influence of this legislation, enacted in the very spirit of

the constitution, and sanctioned by the great name of Washington, the country commenced its sublime march of independence; and was not then, as now, possessed of that devil, that demon spirit, which to-day rends and distracts her.

In that day, sir, it was everywhere declared and admitted that slavery did not exist by virtue of the constitution; that the constitution did not operate on any class of men, black or white, as property, but only and always as persons; that the institution of slavery was purely local, sectional, not national; existing only within the limits of such of the States as tolerated it, and there only by force of local, not national, law; that slavery was a great evil to the master and slave, foreign to the spirit of our laws and institutions, an evil to be softened, not aggravated, to be got rid of and ended, not to be spread into new lands to be perpetuated and eternized. Unhappily, the time came in the history of the Republic when these just sentiments and this wise national legislation to which I have referred, came to be questioned and denounced.

This was the beginning of this sectional strife. When and by whom was this strife inaugurated, by whom has it been continued, and who and what party are responsible for its continuance?

In the year 1803, by a treaty of purchase, the United States acquired from France the Territory of Louisiana. This acquisition was made confessedly without warrant in the constitution, but under a supposed public necessity. In 1804, an organic act was passed for the government of so much of this Territory as lay south of the thirty-third parallel of north latitude. By that act the traffic in foreign and domestic slaves was prohibited in that Territory, under the penalty of fine and the emancipation of the slaves. Jef-

ferson, in his approval of this act, was either ignorant or careless of the alleged duty of this government to protect the slave property of the citizens of the slave States in the national Territories. It was clearly a violation of this alleged duty to provide that the citizen should not traffic in his slave property in that Territory without subjecting himself to fine and forfeiture.

The subsequent organization of Missouri as a slave State within that Territory, and her application for admission as such into the Union, gave rise to the first great sectional conflict, which was finally determined by the admission of that State, and the enactment of the compromise act of 1820, by which chattel slavery was forever excluded from all that territory lying west of Missouri and north of the parallel of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude.

After this compromise, the nation reposed in peace, and its policy in favor of free territory and the protection of free labor was deemed settled, until about the year 1830, when, under the beneficent effects of this policy, it became apparent that, unless it was abandoned, slavery itself must give way and cease to be in the slave States, by the general consent and in obedience to the ever-increasing demands for free labor. Then, sir, Maryland tolerated open and active efforts among her citizens for the abolition of domestic slavery. Then Kentucky tolerated like efforts for the abolition of slavery among her citizens; and Virginia saw and felt in every fibre of her existence that she must either throw off that giant wrong, or perish in its embrace. Her legislative assembly about that time engaged in a debate on the question of the total abolition of the system; some of her ablest citizens insisting upon it, foremost among whom was a distinguished gentleman who, but the other day, was appointed

our minister plenipotentiary to France [Mr. Faulkner] who repeated the expressive and prophetic admonition of Jefferson: "You must adopt some plan of emancipation, or worse will follow." It was then, sir, that in the South this sectional strife was again renewed, by opposing emancipation and by making war upon the great and beneficent policy of protection to free labor. That strife was by the South brought into these halls, and here inaugurated, by demanding that the system of protecting and encouraging the free labor of the freemen of this country by legislation should be abandoned. That sectional party in the South, then, as now, ostracized every open and avowed friend of emancipation and of protection to free labor. . . .

Whatever pretexts may have been urged, the real purpose of the South, in assailing this policy of protection, was to secure an advantage to the slave-owners of the South, at the expense of the free laborers of the whole country, North and South. The abandonment of this system for such a purpose involved the practical application, in the legislation of the country, of the specious dogma that the constitution was made for the minority; it involved the specific disavowal of the expressed intent and purpose of the constitution, "the promotion of the general welfare," of the greatest good of the greatest number; it involved the sacrifice of the interests of the many for the benefit of the few. What was this, sir, but a demand that Congress should so legislate as to make slave labor more profitable, and free labor less profitable?

That has been the demand, the end, and aim, of this sectional party, from that day to this. The watchword of this party then was, and still is, the expansion and protection of slavery and slave labor, at the sacrifice of free labor, by

the withdrawal of legislative protection from it. To accomplish the repeal of the laws which protected free labor, then, as now, the South blustered, and threatened secession and treason. South Carolina passed her ordinance and test act, so offensive and treasonable in terms, as to wring from the gentle spirit of her Grimké, in her Senate Chamber, the burning invective:

“Your ordinance . . . is the grave of liberty. Before I will pollute my lips or perjure my soul with your test oath, you may cut off my right hand and nail it up as a finger-board to point my way to the gibbet.”

That State became a military encampment; the cry to arms was everywhere heard within her borders, and the treasonable purpose of armed resistance to the laws everywhere proclaimed.

Strange, sir, that armed resistance in South Carolina to the national laws for the protection of free labor should be hailed as patriotism, and those who advised or attempted it crowned with honors, while an old man, into whose soul the iron of oppression has entered, who, in his wild dream of duty, lifts his hand against the slave laws of Virginia, hoping thereby to shiver the fetters which bind four million of men, and lift them from the darkness of their prison-house into the sunlight of liberty, is denounced as a traitor, and strangled as a felon. What part, sir, did the President, who now complains of sectional strife, play in this sectional raid upon the laws and the interests of free labor, in this attempt to paralyze the mighty arm of intelligent industry, in which is the nation’s strength, in order to secure increased profits to the few, who produce by proxy, and live upon the unpaid toil of slaves?

Go read the record of his shameless surrender of the interests and rights of free labor to the rebels against the law, the conspirators against the national prosperity. I commend that page which records his conflict with honest John Davis, of Massachusetts. Hear this, our present complacent counsellor and adviser against "sectional hatred and strife," and urge the sectional demands of South Carolina, in words that should be remembered only to blast him: "Reduce," said he, "the standard of prices in this country, to the standard of prices in Europe, and you cover our country with blessings and benefits." That is, make your sons of honest toil, in your fields, and shops, and mines, work for the pittance of sixpence a day, as in plundered, oppressed, and fettered Spain, and France, and Austria, and you cover our country — that is, the non-laboring, non-producing few of the South — "with blessings and benefits." To allay this sectional strife, this demand was, to a great extent, complied with.

Notwithstanding this suicidal change of the national policy, avowedly, to enable the slaveholder to buy cheaper, and sell at an increased profit by obtaining a reciprocal reduction of duties upon his slave products in the foreign market; notwithstanding this blow dealt by the government upon the mighty brotherhood of free, intelligent industry in the North, the free States, though inferior in fertility and in climate and territorial extent and geographical position to the slave States, maintained the ascendancy in wealth, population, intelligence; and, unless further interfered with by additional sectional legislation, would inevitably soon assert such an influence in the administration of the government as would permanently restore the time-honored policy of protection to free labor, North and South. That fact was made

apparent by the great political revolution of 1840, and the protective enactment of 1842. To check this ever-increasing political influence of free labor—this triumph of freedom over slavery, of light over darkness, of right over wrong—these same pro-slavery sectionalists insisted upon the repeal of the protective act of 1842, and the maintenance by legislation of the political equilibrium of the slave with the free States. That was the proposition of Mr. Calhoun. I regret that an intellect so strong, and once so national as was his, could be cribbed and fettered by this sectional spirit which demanded legislation for the few, to the lasting injury of the many. He yielded to the demands of this sectional spirit, this slave interest, and, as its champion, insisted that the advancing column of free labor should be checked, and made to halt in its rapid and sublime march to await the lagging step of the fettered bondman.

To maintain this political equilibrium, having converted all the territory south of the thirty-sixth parallel into slave States, including Florida, all North was to be declared a trust held in common for the slave and free States, into which slavery was to go with the citizen of the slave States, and to be acknowledged and protected there under the constitution. This proposition involved the avoidance or repeal of all that legislation which had, by the consent of Monroe and Jackson, and Van Buren and Polk, forever excluded slavery from the national Territories between the compromise line of 1820 and the Pacific Ocean. It was but the announcement of that political blasphemy and atheism which declares that it is right to enslave labor, to take away by law from honest toil, and honest endeavor, and honest purpose its just reward—proclaiming that a man shall not reap where he has sown; that he shall not enjoy the fruit

of his own toil; that the roof-tree which his own hands have reared shall not be for shelter or defence to him or his children.

To maintain the equilibrium of the slave with the free States, the federal government must, by legislation, counteract the laws of population and growth; must essay to annul the great law of human progress, the law of civilization, that they who cultivate the land shall possess it. Intelligence, the central orb in our industrial, political, and social system, must pale its splendors in the darkening shadows of a perpetual and ever-increasing despotism, that the political equilibrium of the slave States may be maintained. To accomplish this end, this sectional party further demanded that a foreign slave State, as large in territorial extent as New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, should be annexed as a slave State to the Union, for the twofold purpose of furnishing to Virginia a new market in which to make merchandise of her children, and securing to a sparse slave population of two hundred thousand a senatorial representation equal to that of the Empire State with her three million freemen.

The proposition shocked right-minded citizens and patriots of all parties and of all sections. The great commoner of Kentucky opposed it as a violation of the nation's plighted faith, and, with the prescience of a seer, proclaimed that its accomplishment would involve the country in the two greatest of all national calamities — national dishonor and national war. That pure and noble man, Mr. J. Q. Adams, who for fifty years had stood a warder of civilization and liberty, denounced it as treason to the rights of man. The once chosen of the Democracy to the chief magistracy, Mr. Van Buren, also denounced it as dangerous to the peace and honor of the country. This proposition, sir, was the

very incarnation of that demon spirit of sectional strife. This sectional party banded together and trampled down the good men and true, who rejected, with honest scorn, the monstrous purpose. They hunted the noble and lion-hearted Kentuckian to his grave, and, aided by such traitors to the right in the North as the present chief magistrate, they hunted down the noble and patriotic Silas Wright.

In accomplishing this infamy, this party committed a wanton, deliberate violation of that constitution which the immediate actors in this wrong were sworn to support, that constitution which these same gentlemen have now the audacity to say is with them sacred as life itself! Where, sirs, was your reverence for the constitution when the treaty-making power — the only power under the constitution which can contract with foreign states — was struck down; its solemn rejection of the proposed contract of Texan annexation treated with contempt and set aside by the wicked and flagitious joint resolutions, sustained by a majority of one in the Senate, and by which Texas came into the Union? This perfidious act of aggression was no sooner done, your banner of liberty was no sooner advanced to wave in solemn mockery over a land of slaves in this newly-acquired domain, than this party took another step forward in this war of aggression, and asserted that the left bank of the Rio Grande was the western boundary of this new slave State, and, to establish it, sent the army of the United States forward, under the lead, but against the protest, of that brave man, Zachary Taylor. You did establish and mark that line, not only by the waters of that river, rolling in silent majesty from the mountains to the sea, but you marked it as well by a ineffaceable, crimson line of blood.

Having thus fixed the Texan boundary, this sectional

party demanded indemnity for the past and security for the future. Indemnity, sir, for what? Not for what we lost, but for what we took and held by force, and without color of right. Security for what? Not security for a violated constitution; not security for the rights of freemen and free labor, which had been cloven down; but security for the "great humanitarian fact," as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Curry] called the institution of slavery. To this end, this sectional party, by the national arm, conquered large portions of Mexico, and annexed them, softening the venality of the act by the formula of a constrained treaty of peace at Guadalupe Hidalgo. That these acquisitions were made for this purpose, let the subsequent conduct of this sectional party bear witness.

California, a portion of this Mexican acquisition, was rich in gold, in a genial climate, in a fruitful soil, and commanding in geographical and commercial position. Such a country was not without strong attractions to an ardent, energetic, and adventurous people. They forsook all the endearments, and burst away from all the ties of home and kindred, and took possession of the land of gold. A nation was born in a day. A new State was thus created as by magic, washed by the quiet waves and guarded by the Golden Gates of the great Pacific. The people of California, and also of New Mexico, formed each a free constitution, and hand in hand they came, in the white robes of freedom, asking for admission as free States into the Union. This constitutional exercise of the right of petition was made the occasion for a wild storm of sectional agitation.

In the midst of the tumult, the brave patriot, President Taylor, the chosen of the people, resident in the South, but not of this sectional party; full of years and full of honors; calm

and collected, just and honest, with a patriarchal simplicity, said, let these new free States come in; there is room for them in the paternal mansion—in that great Union built for freedom by those mighty men of old, whom God taught to build for glory and for beauty. No, cried this sectional party, we insist that the proposed constitutions embrace too much territory for perpetual freedom; those Territories must be divided; a part of these great regions at least must be kept in reserve for slavery; they, together with Utah, must be divided by the thirty-sixth parallel. That was the ultimatum; it must be acceded to, or the Union should perish.

These sectional partisans hissed like so many serpents upon the path of the brave old man, President Taylor, whose whole life had been spent in the camp or on the battle-field. He was denounced as a traitor—not to his country, but to the slave interest—and was hunted, with a relentless persecution, to his grave. He adhered, thank God—he adhered with more than an eastern devotion, to the right of the people and the highest interests of the country. Thus steadfast in his great purpose, the last summons came, not too soon for him, but too soon for us. Death laid his hand upon that manly form, and at its touch his great and noble spirit departed, articulating those grand words, noble as ever fell from hero's or patriot's lips before, "I have tried to do my duty." Sir, it was not in the field of poised battle; it was not when the earthquake and the fire led the charge; it was not when victory, with its lance-light and triumph singing, threw its splendors around the person of that heroic man, that his great character so fully revealed itself, as in that dread hour, and the near coming of the shadow of death, when he said, "I have tried to do my duty."

When all was over, when the strong arm which had con-

quered, and the clarion voice which had commanded in the storm of battle, were powerless and hushed, those who had assailed his motives—who had resisted his purposes of justice and fair dealing with the young Pacific States—those sectional agitators and aggressors took fresh courage, whispering, like gibbering ghosts, above his perished dust, “after life’s fitful fever he sleeps well.” The agitation, the aggression, the conspiracy against free principles, free labor, and equal rights, went on. California was admitted; but New Mexico was rejected, and remanded to the condition of a territorial organization, with the concession to the slave interest that Congress should not then exercise its admitted power of legislation for the protection of liberty and right, either in that Territory or in Utah.

Yes, sir; the free North, with her twenty million of free-men, for the sake of peace, submitted to the humiliation of the demand of this sectional party, that in those vast Territories the law of God should not be re-enacted, as Mr. Webster called the law of liberty. That great man, now sleeping in his tomb by the great sea, at the demand of this power, yielded up his own convictions, and not only consented to this, but joined with others in yielding a reluctant assent to the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850—a law which, in direct violation of the constitution, transfers the judicial power from judges duly appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate, to irresponsible commissioners appointed by the circuit courts, tendering them a bribe of five dollars, if, upon *ex parte* evidence—the affidavit of some unknown man, taken in the rice swamps of Florida, it may be, before some justice of the peace—he shall adjudge a man brought before him on his warrant, a fugitive slave, guilty of the crime of preferring liberty to bondage.

## DEAN STANLEY



ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, LL.D., a distinguished English clergyman, Dean of Westminster, and after Maurice's death leader of the "Broad Church" party, was born at Alderley, Cheshire, Dec. 13, 1815, and died at Westminster, July 18, 1881. The son of the bishop of Norwich he was educated at Rugby under Dr. Arnold, and at Balliol College, Oxford University. In 1838, he gained a fellowship at University College, Oxford, and in the following year was admitted to deacon's orders in the Established Church; he was advanced to the priesthood in 1843, and in the same year received an appointment as college tutor. From 1845 to 1847, Stanley was select preacher to the university, his discourses being issued in 1847 as "Sermons on the Apostolical Age," and exhibiting very clearly his divergence from High Church and evangelical points of doctrine. He resigned his fellowship in 1851 in order to accept a canonry at Canterbury, but returned to Oxford in 1858 as canon of Christ Church and regius professor of ecclesiastical history. During these years he came into much prominence as a Broad Church leader, his tolerant mind being opposed in equal measure to severe judgments against the ritualists, or against Bishop Colenso, whose work on the "Pentateuch" was then convulsing the church. His sympathies with free thought were shown at this time also by his attitude toward the then greatly derided "Essays and Reviews." The basis of his theology was insistence upon Christian character rather than on dogma as the essentials of Christianity. In 1863, he declined the archbishopric of Dublin, but accepted in the year following the deanery of Westminster. He had for some years enjoyed the esteem and friendship of the late Queen Victoria and at the close of 1863 was married to Lady Augusta Bruce, an intimate friend of Her Majesty. As Dean of Westminster he endeavored to make the services at the Abbey attractive to men of all communions. To preach to his evening congregations at the Abbey, he was accustomed to ask clergymen of note in the Scottish church, as well as English Nonconformists. In 1878, he visited the United States, publishing on his return "Addresses and Sermons Delivered in the United States and Canada." Stanley was a sympathetic rather than a profound scholar, and his writings, while interesting and well written, can hardly be said to possess enduring value. His "Life of Thomas Arnold" (1844) is his best and most widely known work. Among others are "Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church" (1861); "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church" (1862-72); "Addresses and Sermons Delivered at St. Andrews" (1877); "Essays, Chiefly on Questions of Church and State, from 1850 to 1870" (1870); and a work on "Sinai and Palestine." He was also author of "Historical Memorials of Canterbury," and "Memorials of Westminster Abbey," of a work on the "Epistle to the Corinthians," "Sermons Preached in the East," and "Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford," besides many fugitive sermons and numerous contributions to reviews and magazines.

## SERMON: JESUS OF NAZARETH

" Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, 'Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews.' "—John xix, 19.

**W**HAT are the lessons of Good Friday? especially of Good Friday in Palestine and in this place? In the words of the text, in the title written on the cross, the name of Jesus Christ is at that supreme moment of his Last Passion brought together with the recollection of his early years at Nazareth. What are the lessons which they both teach in common?

Everywhere the event of Good Friday speaks to us of the universal love of God to his creatures. That is why it is so truly called Good Friday. It has its good news as much as Christmas Day or Easter Day. It tells us not only that God is Love, but that he bears love to every one on earth, however far they may seem to be removed from him. It was for this that he sent his Son into the world,— it was for this that Christ died. It was by his death, more even than by his life, that he showed how his sympathy extended far beyond his own nation, his own friends, his own family.

"I, if I be lifted up" on the cross, "will draw all men unto me."

It is this which the Collects of this day bring before us. They speak, in fact, of hardly anything else. They tell us how he died that "all estates," not one estate only, but "all estates in his Holy Church," — that "every member of the Church" in its widest sense, not the clergy or the religious only, but every one, in his "several vocation and ministry," might "truly and godly serve him."

They pray for God's mercy to visit not Christians merely, but all religions, however separate from ours,—“Jews, Turks, Heretics and Infidels,”—in the hope that they may all at last, here or hereafter, be “one fold under one shepherd,” the One Good Shepherd who laid down his life not for the flock of one single fold only, but for the countless sheep scattered on the hills, not of the fold of the Jewish people, or of the Christian Church only, but of all mankind.

This is a truth which comes home to us with peculiar force in Palestine. What is it that has made this small country so famous? What is it that has carried the names of Jerusalem and of Nazareth to the uttermost parts of the earth? It is in one word, “the death of Christ.” Had he not died as he did, his religion,—his name,—his country,—the places of his birth and education and life,—would never have broken through all the bonds of time and place as they have. That we are here at all on this day, is a proof of the effect which his death has had even on the outward fortunes of the world.

This universal love of God in Christ's death is specially impressed upon us in Nazareth. What Christ was in his death, he was in his life. What he was in his life, he was in his death. And if we wish to know the spirit which pervades both, we cannot do so better than by seeing what we may call the text of his first sermon at Nazareth. He was in the synagogue. The roll of the Hebrew Scriptures was handed to him. He unrolled it. His former friends and acquaintances fixed their eyes upon him to see what he would say.

And what were the words which he chose? They were these: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the cap-

tives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.” What he said on this text is not described; we are only told that they “marvelled at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth.”

But what those gracious words were we can well see from the words of the passage itself.

“The Spirit of the Lord was upon him,” first, “to preach the Gospel to the poor,” the glad tidings of God’s love to the poor, the humble classes, the neglected classes, the dangerous classes, the friendless, the oppressed, the unthought-for, the unearched-for.

The Spirit of God was upon him, secondly, “to heal the broken-hearted:”—to heal, as a good physician heals, not with one medicine, but with all the various medicines and remedies which Infinite Wisdom possesses, all the fractures and diseases and infirmities of our poor human hearts.

There is not a weakness, there is not a sorrow, there is not a grievance, for which the love of God, as seen in the life and death of Christ, does not offer some remedy. He has not overlooked us. He is with us. He remembers us. The Spirit of God was upon him, thirdly, “to preach deliverance to the captive.”

Whatever be the evil habit, or the inveterate prejudice, or the master passion, or the long indulgence, which weighs upon us like a bondage, he feels for us, and will do his utmost to set us free,—to set at liberty those that are cramped and bruised and confined by the chain of their sins, their weakness, their misfortunes, their condition in life, their difficulties, their responsibilities, their want of responsibilities, their employments, their want of employments.

And, fourthly, “The Spirit of God was upon him,” to

“give sight to the blind.” How few of us there are who know our own failings, who see into our own hearts, who know what is really good for us! That is the knowledge which the thought of Christ’s death is likely to give us. That is the truth, which, above all other truths, is likely to set us free. “Lord, that I may receive my sight,” is the prayer which each of us may offer up for our spiritual state, as the poor man whom he met at Jericho did for his bodily eyesight.

For every one of these conditions he died. Not for those only who are professedly religious, but for those who are the least so,— to them the message of Good Friday and of Nazareth is especially addressed. Christianity is, one may almost say, the only religion, of which the Teacher addressed himself, not to the religious, not to the ecclesiastical, not to the learned world, but to the irreligious, or the non-religious, to those who thought little of themselves and were thought little of by others, to the careless, to the thoughtless, to the rough publican, to the wild prodigal, to the heretical Samaritan, to the heathen soldier, to the thankless peasants of Nazareth, to the swarming populations of Galilee. He addresses himself now, to each of us, however lowly we may be in our own eyes, however little we think that we have a religious call, however encompassed we are with infirmities; his love is ready to receive, to encourage, to cherish, to save us.

I pass to the other lesson which Good Friday teaches us here. It is that, whatever good is to be done in the world, even though it is God himself who does it, cannot be done without an effort,— a preparation,— a Sacrifice. So it was especially in the death of Christ,— so it was in his whole life. His whole life from the time when he grew up, “as a tender plant” in the seclusion of this valley, to the hour when he died at Jerusalem, was one long effort,— one long struggle

against misunderstanding, opposition, scorn, hatred, hardship, pain.

He had doubtless his happier and gentler hours, we must not forget them: his friends at Bethany, his apostles who hung upon his lips, his mother who followed him in thought and mind wherever he went. But here, amongst his own people, he met with angry opposition and jealousy. He had to bear the hardships of toil and labor, like any other Nazarene artisan. He had here, by a silent preparation of thirty years, to make himself ready for the work which lay before him. He had to endure the heat and the cold, the burning sun and the stormy rain, of these hills and valleys. "The foxes" of the plain of Esdraelon "have holes," "the birds" of the Galilean forests "have their nests," but "he had" often "not where to lay his head."

And in Jerusalem, though there were momentary bursts of enthusiasm in his behalf, yet he came so directly across the interests, the fears, the pleasures, and the prejudices of those who there ruled and taught, that at last it cost him his life. By no less a sacrifice could the world be redeemed, by no less a struggle could his work be finished.

In that work, in one sense, none but he can take part. "He trod the winepress alone." But in another sense, often urged upon us in the Bible, we must all take part in it, if we would wish to do good to ourselves or to others. We cannot improve ourselves, we cannot assist others, we cannot do our duty in the world, except by exertion, except by unpopularity, except with annoyance, except with care and difficulty. We must, each of us, bear our cross with him. When we bear it, it is lightened by thinking of him. When we bear it, each day makes it easier to us. Once the name of "Christian," of "Nazarene," was an offence in the eyes

of the world; now, it is a glory. But we cannot have the glory without the labor which it involves. To "hear his words, and to do them," to hear of his death, and to follow in the path of his sufferings, this, and this only, as he himself has told us, is to build our house, the house of our life; of our faith, of our happiness, upon a rock; a rock which will grow firmer and stronger the more we build upon it, and the more we have to bear.

"The rains may descend, and the floods may come, and the winds may blow and may beat upon that house;" but the house will not fall, "for it will have been founded upon the rock."

# FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON

**F**RDERICK WILLIAM ROBERTSON, a distinguished English clergyman and pulpit orator, was born at London, Feb. 3, 1816, and died at Brighton, Aug. 15, 1853. The son of an army officer, his early wish was to enter the army, but relinquishing this desire he matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford University, and took orders in the Anglican Church in 1840. For the next two years he held a curacy at Winchester, and for four years more was curate of Christ Church, Cheltenham. In 1847, he became incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, where he immediately became a living force in the community. As an eminent English critic has remarked, "There is perhaps no parallel in English Church history to the influence of Robertson's ministry at a small proprietary chapel." The six years of his ministry at Brighton marked an important epoch, not only in the history of that Sussex watering-place, but in that of English religious thought, his liberalizing influence being felt in constantly widening circles in the Established Church and in the Nonconformist bodies also, and before long extending to America. Robertson had a singular success in reaching the working classes, and his founding of a workingmen's institute in 1849 was one of the important incidents in his career. No English preacher of his time was more untrammelled than he, and perhaps none more original. His fearless course subjected him to more or less detraction and misrepresentation, and being a man of extreme sensitiveness and little sense of humor, he felt keenly the attacks upon him on account of his liberal theological views. His sensitiveness to adverse criticism and the intense earnestness with which he threw himself into his work wore him out long before his time. His reputation as a preacher is firmly established upon five series of "Sermons Preached at Trinity Chapel" (1855-90). Other works which he left are "Lectures and Addresses on Literary and Social Topics" (1858); "Expository Lectures on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians" (1859); "Notes on Genesis" (1877). With a selection of his Sermons, his "Life and Letters" have been published.

## SERMON: THE LONELINESS OF CHRIST

"Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe? Behold, the hour cometh, ye are now come, that ye shall be scattered every man to his own, and shall leave me alone; and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."—John xvi, 31, 32.

HERE are two kinds of solitude: the first consisting of insulation in space; the other, of isolation of the spirit. The first is simply separation by distance. When we are seen, touched, heard by none, we are said to be alone. And all hearts respond to the truth of that saying, This is not solitude; for sympathy can people our solitude with a crowd. The fisherman on the ocean alone at night is not alone, when he remembers the earnest longings which are arising up to heaven at home for his safety. The traveller is not alone, when the faces which will greet him on his arrival seem to beam upon him as he trudges on. The solitary student is not alone, when he feels that human hearts will respond to the truths which he is preparing to address to them.

The other is loneliness of soul. There are times when hands touch ours, but only send an icy chill of unsympathizing indifference to the heart; when eyes gaze into ours, but with a glazed look which cannot read into the bottom of our souls; when words pass from our lips, but only come back as an echo reverberated without reply through a dreary solitude; when the multitude throng and press us, and we cannot say, as Christ said, "Somebody hath touched me:" for the contact has been not between soul and soul, but only between form and form.

And there are two kinds of men, who feel this last solitude in different ways. The first are the men of self-reliance,—self-dependent: who ask no counsel, and crave no sympathy; who act and resolve alone,—who can go sternly through duty, and scarcely shrink, let what will be crushed in them. Such men command respect: for whoever respects himself constrains the respect of others. They are invaluable in all those professions of life in which sensitive feeling

would be a superfluity: they make iron commanders, surgeons who do not shrink, and statesmen who do not flinch from their purpose for the dread of unpopularity. But mere self-dependence is weakness; and the conflict is terrible when a human sense of weakness is felt by such men.

Jacob was alone when he slept in his way to Padan Aram, the first night that he was away from his father's roof, with the world before him, and all the old broken up; and Elijah was alone in the wilderness when the court had deserted him, and he said, "They have digged down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword: and I, even I, only am left, and they seek my life to take it away." But the loneliness of the tender Jacob was very different from that of the stern Elijah. To Jacob the sympathy he yearned for was realized in the form of a gentle dream. A ladder raised from earth to heaven figured the possibility of communion between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God. In Elijah's case, the storm, and the earthquake, and the fire, did their convulsing work in the soul, before a still, small voice told him that he was not alone. In such a spirit the sense of weakness comes with a burst of agony, and the dreadful conviction of being alone manifests itself with a rending of the heart of rock. It is only so that such souls can be taught that the Father is with them, and that they are not alone.

There is another class of men, who live in sympathy. These are affectionate minds, which tremble at the thought of being alone: not from want of courage nor from weakness of intellect comes their dependence upon others, but from the intensity of their affections. It is the trembling spirit of humanity in them. They want not aid, nor even countenance, but only sympathy. And the trial comes to them not in the shape of fierce struggle, but of chill and utter loneli-

ness, when they are called upon to perform a duty on which the world looks coldly, or to embrace a truth which has not found lodgment yet in the breasts of others.

It is to this latter and not to the former class that we must look, if we would understand the spirit in which the words of the text were pronounced. The deep humanity of the Soul of Christ was gifted with those finer sensibilities of affectionate nature which stand in need of sympathy. He not only gave sympathy, but wanted it, too, from others. He who selected the gentle John to be his friend,—who found solace in female sympathy, attended by the women who ministered to him out of their substance,—who in the Trial hour could not bear even to pray without the human presence, which is the pledge and reminder of God's presence, had nothing in him of the hard, merely self-dependent character. Even this verse testifies to the same fact. A stern spirit never could have said, "I am not alone: the Father is with me;" never would have felt the loneliness which needed the balancing truth. These words tell of a struggle, an inward reasoning, a difficulty and a reply, a sense of solitude,—"I shall be alone;" and an immediate correction of that: "Not alone: the Father is with me."

There is no thought connected with the life of Christ more touching, none that seems so peculiarly to characterize his Spirit, as the solitariness in which he lived. Those who understood him best only understood him half. Those who knew him best scarcely could be said to know him. On this occasion the disciples thought, Now we do understand, now we do believe. The lonely Spirit answered, "Do ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone."

Very impressive is that trait in his history. He was in this world alone.

First, then, we meditate on the loneliness of Christ;  
Secondly, on the temper of his solitude.

The loneliness of Christ was caused by the divine elevation of his character. His infinite superiority severed him from sympathy; his exquisite affectionateness made that want of sympathy a keen trial.

There is a second-rate greatness which the world can comprehend. If we take two who are brought into direct contrast by Christ himself, the one the type of human, the other that of divine excellence, the Son of Man and John the Baptist, this becomes clearly manifest. John's life had a certain rude, rugged goodness, on which was written, in characters which required no magnifying glass to read, spiritual excellence. The world, on the whole, accepted him. Pharisees and Sadducees went to his baptism. The people idolized him as a prophet; and, if he had not chanced to cross the path of a weak prince and a revengeful woman, we can see no reason why John might not have finished his course with joy, recognized as irreproachable. If we inquire why it was that the world accepted John and rejected Christ, one reply appears to be, that the life of the one was finitely simple and one-sided, that of the other divinely complex. In physical nature, the naturalist finds no difficulty in comprehending the simple structure of the lowest organizations of animal life, where one uniform texture, and one organ performing the office of brain and heart and lungs, at once, leave little to perplex.

But when he comes to study the complex anatomy of man, he has the labor of a lifetime before him. It is not difficult to master the constitution of a single country; but when you try to understand the universe, you find infinite appearances of contradiction: law opposed by law; motion balanced by

motion; happiness blended with misery; and the power to elicit a divine order and unity out of this complex variety is given to only a few of the gifted of the race. That which the structure of man is to the structure of the limpet, that which the universe is to a single country, the complex and boundless soul of Christ was to the souls of other men.

Therefore, to the superficial observer, his life was a mass of inconsistencies and contradictions. All thought themselves qualified to point out the discrepancies. The Pharisees could not comprehend how a holy Teacher could eat with publicans and sinners. His own brethren could not reconcile his assumption of a public office with the privacy which he aimed at keeping. "If thou doest these things, show thyself to the world." Some thought he was "a good man;" others said, "Nay, but he deceiveth the people."

And hence it was that he lived to see all that acceptance which had marked the earlier stage of his career — as, for instance, at Capernaum — melt away. First, the Pharisees took the alarm; then the Sadducees; then the political party of the Herodians; then the people. That was the most terrible of all, for the enmity of the upper classes is impotent; but when that cry of brute force is stirred from the deeps of society, as deaf to the voice of reason as the ocean in its strength churned into raving foam by the winds, the heart of mere earthly oak quails before that. The apostles, at all events, did quail. One denied; another betrayed; all deserted. They "were scattered, each to his own;" and the Truth himself was left alone in Pilate's judgment-hall.

Now learn from this a very important distinction. To feel solitary is no uncommon thing. To complain of being alone, without sympathy, and misunderstood, is general enough. In every place, in many a family, these victims of diseased

sensibility are to be found, and they might find a weakening satisfaction in observing a parallel between their own feelings and those of Jesus. But before that parallel is assumed be very sure that it is, as in his case, the elevation of your character which severs you from your species. The world has small sympathy for divine goodness; but it also has little for a great many other qualities which are disagreeable to it. You meet with no response; you are passed by; find yourself unpopular; meet with little communion.

Well! Is that because you are above the world,— nobler, devising and executing grand plans, which they cannot comprehend; vindicating the wronged; proclaiming and living on great principles; offending it by the saintliness of your purity, and the unworldliness of your aspirations?

Then yours is the loneliness of Christ. Or is it that you are wrapped up in self,— cold, disobliging, sentimental, indifferent about the welfare of others, and very much astonished that they are not deeply interested in you? You must not use these words of Christ. They have nothing to do with you.

Let us look at one or two of the occasions on which this loneliness was felt.

The first time was when he was but twelve years old, when his parents found him in the Temple, hearing the doctors and asking them questions. High thoughts were in the Child's soul: expanding views of life; larger views of duty, and his own destiny.

There is a moment in every true life — to some it comes very early — when the old routine of duty is not large enough; when the parental roof seems too low, because the Infinite above is arching over the soul; when the old formulas, in creeds, catechisms, and articles, seem to be narrow, and they must either be thrown aside, or else transformed into living

and breathing realities; **when** the earthly father's authority is being superseded by the claims of a Father in heaven.

That is a lonely, lonely moment, when the young soul first feels God — when this earth is recognized as an “awful place, yea, the very gate of heaven;” when the dream-ladder is seen planted against the skies, and we wake, and the dream haunts us as a sublime reality.

You may detect the approach of that moment in the young man or the young woman by the awakened spirit of inquiry; by a certain restlessness of look, and an eager earnestness of tone; by the devouring study of all kinds of books; by the waning of your own influence, while the inquirer is asking the truth of the doctors and teachers in the vast Temple of the world; by a certain opinionativeness, which is austere and disagreeable enough; but the austerest moment of the fruit's taste is that in which it is passing from greenness into ripeness. If you wait in patience, the sour will become sweet. Rightly looked at, that opinionativeness is more truly anguish; the fearful solitude of feeling the insecurity of all that is human; the discovery that life is real, and forms of social and religious existence hollow. The old moorings are torn away, and the soul is drifting, drifting, drifting, very often without compass, except the guidance of an unseen hand, into the vast infinite of God. Then come the lonely words, and no wonder, “How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?”

That solitude was felt by Christ in trial. In the desert, in Pilate's judgment-hall, in the garden, he was alone; and alone must every son of man meet his trial-hour. The individuality of the soul necessitates that. Each man is a new soul in this world untried, with a boundless Possible before him. No one can predict what he may become, prescribe his duties, or mark

out his obligations. Each man's own nature has its own peculiar rules; and he must take up his life-plan alone, and persevere in it in a perfect privacy with which no stranger intermeddleth. Each man's temptations are made up of a host of peculiarities, internal and external, which no other mind can measure.

You are tried alone; alone you pass into the desert; alone you must bear and conquer in the Agony; alone you must be sifted by the world. There are moments known only to a man's own self, when he sits by the poisoned springs of existence, "yearning for a morrow which shall free him from the strife." And there are trials more terrible than that. Not when vicious inclinations are opposed to holy, but when virtue conflicts with virtue, is the real rending of the soul in twain. A temptation, in which the lower nature struggles for mastery, can be met by the whole united force of the spirit.

But it is when obedience to a heavenly Father can be only paid by disobedience to an earthly one; or fidelity to duty can be only kept by infidelity to some entangling engagement; or the straight path must be taken over the misery of others; or the counsel of the affectionate friend must be met with a "Get thee behind me, Satan:—"—O! it is then, when human advice is unavailable, that the soul feels what it is to be alone.

Once more:—the Redeemer's soul was alone in dying. The hour had come,—they were all gone, and he was, as he predicted, left alone. All that is human drops from us in that hour. Human faces flit and fade, and the sounds of the world become confused. "I shall die alone,"—yes, and alone you live. The philosopher tells us that no atom in creation touches another atom,—they only approach within a certain distance; then the attraction ceases, and an invisible something repels,—they only seem to touch.

No soul touches another soul except at one or two points, and those chiefly external,—a fearful and a lonely thought, but one of the truest of life. Death only realizes that which has been fact all along. In the central deeps of our being we are alone.

The spirit or temper of that solitude.

Observe its grandeur. I am alone, yet not alone. There is a feeble and sentimental way in which we speak of the Man of Sorrows. We turn to the Cross, and the Agony, and the Loneliness, to touch the softer feelings—to arouse compassion. You degrade that loneliness by your compassion. Compassion! compassion for him! Adore if you will,—respect and reverence that sublime solitariness with which none but the Father was,—but no pity; let it draw out the firmer and manlier graces of the soul. Even tender sympathy seems out of place.

For even in human things, the strength that is in a man can be only learnt when he is thrown upon his own resources and left alone. What a man can do in conjunction with others does not test the man. Tell us what he can do alone. It is one thing to defend the truth when you know that your audience are already prepossessed, and that every argument will meet a willing response; and it is another thing to hold the truth when truth must be supported, if at all alone,—met by cold looks and unsympathizing suspicion. It is one thing to rush on to danger with the shouts and the sympathy of numbers; it is another thing when the lonely chieftain of the sinking ship sees the last boat-full disengage itself, and folds his arms to go down into the majesty of darkness, crushed, but not subdued.

Such and greater far was the strength and majesty of the Saviour's solitariness. It was not the trial of the lonely

hermit. There is a certain gentle and pleasing melancholy in the life which is lived alone. But there are the forms of nature to speak to him; and he has not the positive opposition of mankind, if he has the absence of actual sympathy. It is a solemn thing, doubtless, to be apart from men, and to feel eternity rushing by like an arrowy river. But the solitude of Christ was the solitude of a crowd. In that single human bosom dwelt the Thought which was to be the germ of the world's life — a thought unshared, misunderstood, or rejected. Can you not feel the grandeur of those words, when the Man, reposing on his solitary strength, felt the last shadow of perfect isolation pass across his soul: — “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

Next, learn from these words self-reliance. “Ye shall leave me alone.” Alone, then, the Son of Man was content to be. He threw himself on his own solitary thought: did not go down to meet the world; but waited, though it might be for ages, till the world should come round to him. He appealed to the future, did not aim at seeming consistent, left his contradictions unexplained: — I came from the Father, — I leave the world, and go to the Father.

“Now,” said they, “thou speakest no proverb:” that is, enigma. But many a hard and enigmatical saying before he had spoken, and he left them all. A thread runs through all true acts, stringing them together into one harmonious chain: but it is not for the Son of God to be anxious to prove their consistency with each other.

This is self-reliance — to repose calmly on the thought which is deepest in our bosoms, and be unmoved if the world will not accept it yet. To live on your own convictions against the world, is to overcome the world — to believe that what is truest in you is true for all: to abide by that, and

not be over-anxious to be heard or understood, or sympathized with, certain that at last all must acknowledge the same, and that, while you stand firm, the world will come round to you — that is independence. It is not difficult to get away into retirement, and there live upon your own convictions; nor is it difficult to mix with men, and follow their convictions; but to enter into the world, and there live out firmly and fearlessly according to your own conscience — that is Christian greatness.

There is a cowardice in this age which is not Christian. We shrink from the consequences of truth. We look round and cling dependently. We ask what men will think; what others will say; whether they will not stare in astonishment. Perhaps they will; but he who is calculating that will accomplish nothing in this life. The Father — the Father which is with us and in us — what does he think? God's work cannot be done without a spirit of independence. A man is got some way in the Christian life when he has learned to say humbly, and yet majestically, "I dare to be alone."

Lastly, remark the humility of this loneliness. Had the Son of Man simply said, I can be alone, he would have said no more than any proud, self-relying man can say; but when he added, "because the Father is with me," that independence assumed another character, and self-reliance became only another form of reliance upon God. Distinguish between genuine and spurious humility. There is a false humility which says, "It is my own poor thought, and I must not trust it. I must distrust my own reason and judgment, because they are my own. I must not accept the dictates of my own conscience; for is it not my own, and is not trust in self the great fault of our fallen nature?"

Very well. Now, remember something else. There is a

Spirit which beareth witness with our spirits; there is a God who "is not far from any one of us;" there is a "Light which lighteth every man which cometh into the world." Do not be unnaturally humble. The thought of your own mind perchance is the Thought of God. To refuse to follow that may be to disown God. To take the judgment and conscience of other men to live by, where is the humility of that? From whence did their conscience and judgment come? Was the fountain from which they drew exhausted for you? If they refused like you to rely on their own conscience, and you rely upon it, how are you sure that it is more the Mind of God than your own which you have refused to hear?

Look at it in another way. The charm of the words of great men — those grand sayings which are recognized as true as soon as heard — is this, that you recognize them as wisdom which passed across your own mind. You feel that they are your own thoughts come back to you, else you would not at once admit them: "All that floated across me before, only I could not say it, and did not feel confident enough to assert it, or had not conviction enough to put into words." Yes, God spoke to you what he did to them: only they believed it, said it, trusted the Word within them, and you did not. Be sure that often when you say, "It is only my own poor thought, and I am alone," the real correcting thought is this, "Alone, but the Father is with me," — therefore I can live by that lonely conviction.

There is no danger in this, whatever timid minds may think — no danger of mistake, if the character be a true one. For we are not in uncertainty in this matter. It has been given us to know our base from our noble hours: to distinguish between the voice which is from above, and that which speaks from below, out of the abyss of our animal and selfish

nature. Samuel could distinguish between the impulse — quite a human one — which would have made him select Eliab out of Jesse's sons, and the deeper judgment by which "the Lord said, Look not on his countenance, nor on the height of his stature, for I have refused him."

Doubtless deep truth of character is required for this: for the whispering voices get mixed together, and we dare not abide by our own thoughts, because we think them our own, and not God's: and this because we only now and then endeavor to know in earnest. It is only given to the habitually true to know the difference. He knew it, because all his blessed life long he could say, "My judgment is just, because I seek not my own will, but the will of him which sent me."

The practical result and inference of all this is a very simple, but a very deep one: the deepest of existence. Let life be a life of faith. Do not go timorously about, inquiring what others think, and what others believe, and what others say. It seems the easiest, it is the most difficult thing in life to do this — believe in God. God is near you. Throw yourself fearlessly upon him. Trembling mortal, there is an unknown might within your soul, which will wake when you command it. The day may come when all that is human — man and woman — will fall off from you, as they did from him. Let his strength be yours. Be independent of them all now. The Father is with you. Look to him, and he will save you.

# NEWMAN HALL



NEWMAN HALL, a noted English Nonconformist divine, was born at Maidstone, Kent, May 22, 1816, and was educated at Highbury College and London University. Entering the Congregational ministry he was from 1842 to 1854 pastor of the Albion Congregational Church at Hull, and in the latter year was called to the Surrey Chapel, Blackfriars Road, London. His London congregation subsequently built a great church in Westminster Bridge Road, in early English Gothic style, its tower, 200 feet high, being erected in memory of Abraham Lincoln with funds collected in England and the United States. When our Civil War broke out, Newman Hall warmly advocated the cause of the North, and subsequently made two extended lecture tours in the United States, seeking by his words and influence to bring about international good feeling. Since 1893 he has been pastor emeritus of the Westminster Bridge Road congregation, London. He is not only widely known as an eloquent preacher, but has had an extended influence as a religious and devotional writer, his famous tract, "Come to Jesus" (1846), having been translated into over twenty languages. Other works by him are "The Land of the Forum and the Vatican" (1855); "The Christian Philosopher Triumphant over Death"; "It Is I"; "Memoir of Rowland Hill"; "Sermons" (1868); "From Liverpool to St. Louis" (1870); "Mountain Musings"; "Pilgrim Songs in Cloud and Sunshine" (1871); "Prayer: Its Reasonableness and Efficacy" (1875), and "Gethsemane; or Leaves of Healing from the Garden of Grief."

## SERMON: CHRISTIAN VICTORY

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the hidden manna, and will give him a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it."—Rev. ii, 17.

THE Christian life is often compared in Scripture to a warfare. Followers of Jesus are "soldiers." They are exhorted to put on "the whole armor of God." They "fight the good fight of faith." Some of you have long been engaged in the conflict: others have more recently entered upon it. But, whether young or old in the Christian career, all find it necessary to be constantly stirred up to watchfulness against the never-ceasing assaults of the foe. It

is not enough to put on the armor and to commence the battle. He that overcometh, and he alone, will receive the salutation, "Well done, good and faithful servant,"—he alone shall "lay hold upon eternal life."

But we are not left to fight without encouragement. As generals before a battle go in front of their troops to stimulate them to valor, so Christ, the Captain of our Salvation, leads on the consecrated hosts of his elect; and having himself set us a glorious example of valor and victory, animates us to follow in his footsteps by the "exceeding great and precious promises" of his Word. Christian warrior!—let your eye be lifted up to him. . . .

A great war is going on between the Church and the powers of darkness. It is not an affair of strategy between two vast armies, wherein skilful manœuvres determine the issue, many on either side never coming into actual combat; but every Christian has to fight hand to hand with the enemy. We cannot be lost in the crowd. We may not stand in the middle of the hollow square, without sharing the perils of the outer rank. Every Christian must not only occupy his post in the grand army, but must personally grapple with the foe.

Before conversion there was no fighting. The devil's suggestions and the heart's inclinations were allied. Then we did the enemy's bidding, or were lulled to sleep by his intoxicating cup. But when light shone into the soul, and we strove to escape, the struggle began. God, as our Creator and Redeemer, justly demands our obedience and love. Whatever interferes with these claims, is an enemy summoning us to battle. The world of frivolity is our foe. How numerous and insinuating are its temptations—the more perilous because of the difficulty of defining them!

Moreover, lawful pleasures and necessary cares become dangerous when they cease to be subordinate to the love of God. The enjoyments he bestows and the labors he appoints, are calculated to minister to godliness,—and yet they may be perverted to idolatry, by our forgetting him on whom our highest thoughts should be fixed. What danger is there that things in themselves holy and beautiful may thus become pernicious and destructive!

The flesh, too, furnishes its contingent to the army of our foes. Not that any of our natural appetites, being divinely bestowed, can have in them the nature of sin. No! the flesh, as God made it, is pure and holy. But those instincts, which, regulated by the revealed will of their Author, are “holiness to the Lord,” may, by unhallowed gratification, become those “fleshly lusts which war against the soul.” As we carry about with us these animal propensities, there is necessity for constant vigilance lest our own nature, being abused, should become our destroyer.

Inbred depravity lurks in the heart of even the true believer. Though dethroned, it is not completely expelled. With what selfishness, covetousness, vanity, hastiness of temper, uncharitableness, have we not to contend! Who has not some sin which most easily besets him? How varied are the forms of unbelief! Spiritual pride, too, corrupts our very graces, piety itself furnishing an occasion of evil, so that when we have conquered some temptation or performed some duty, our victory is often tarnished, our holy things corrupted, by our falling into the snare of self-complacency.

Above all, there is that great adversary who “goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour.” He avails himself of the world, and the flesh, and the infirmities of the spirit, to tempt the soul to sin. This is no fable, although

one of Satan's most skilful stratagems is to make men disbelieve in his existence. Overlooked or despised, a foe is already half victorious. But the Captain of our Salvation, in his word, often warns us both of the craft and of the violence of our adversary. We sometimes read of "the wiles of the devil;" and sometimes of "the fiery darts of the wicked one." They who fail to watch and pray, are sure to be vanquished by such a foe.

These are our enemies! And if we would possess the promise we must "overcome." A mere profession of religion is of no avail. It is not enough for our name to appear on the muster-roll of the camp. Many wear the soldier's dress who know nothing of the soldier's heart. Many are glad to glitter on the grand parade who fall off from the hard-fought, blood-stained battle-field. It is not enough to buckle on our armor; many do this, and lay it aside again. We must devote ourselves entirely and unreservedly to this great daily battle of life.

There is no exemption of persons. Women must fight, as well as men; the tender and the timid must be as Amazons in the conflict. Children must carry the shield, and wield the sword. The aged and infirm must keep the ranks. The sick and wounded must not be carried to the rear. No substitute can be provided, and there is no discharge in this war.

There is no exemption on account of circumstances. The rich and poor, the learned and the unlearned, the cheerful and the sad, all must fight. No accumulation of trouble, no unexpected death of friends, can be an excuse for laying down our arms. We must go to the marriage feast, and we must attend the funeral procession, as warriors, wearing our armor and grasping our weapons. We must be like those spoken

of by Nehemiah, “every man with one hand wrought in the work, and with the other hand held a weapon.”

There is no exemption of place. Foes lie in wait for the Christian wherever he goes—in the mart of commerce, in the busy workshop, when he returns to his home, when he rests on his bed, in the bustle of the day, in the silence of the night, in the circle of his friends, in the bosom of his family, in society, alone, in the city, in the fields, in his walks of benevolence, in his private meditations, in the church, in his secret retirement, when he worships with the great congregation, and when he enters his closet and shuts the door. He can never elude the enemy; he carries the foe in his own breast; the conflict ceases not!

There is no exemption of time, no season of rest. No truce is sounded. Satan never beats a retreat, except to lead us into an ambuscade. No white flag comes out that can be trusted. If we parley, it is at our peril; if we pause, we are wounded or taken captive. Wars on earth may often terminate by mutual agreement. It is a war of extermination; no quarter is given; either we must trample Satan under foot, or Satan will drag us down to hell!

It is a warfare until death. While we are in the body it will be always true—“We wrestle.” The oldest Christian cannot lay aside his weapons. “Having done all, stand.” A great word that! “Having done all!” “What!” you may say, “after a long life of conflict, surely I may put aside my armor, and sheathe my sword, and recline on some sunny bank, and enjoy myself after my victory!”

No; you must not expect it; “having done all” it is enough if you stand at bay on the battle-ground; all you can hope for in this world is to maintain your post, still defying the foe, who will be still meditating fresh attacks. You will

never be able to say with St. Paul, "I have fought a good fight," until you can also say, "I have finished my course."

It is not the appearance of fighting. It is not a few faint, irresolute strokes. "So fight I," said the Apostle, "not as one that beateth the air." We must be resolute, determined, in earnest, giving our enemy no advantage. We must "not give place to the devil." We must watch against the smallest beginnings of sin. By "keeping the heart with all diligence," by putting on "the whole armor of God," by having faith as our shield, righteousness as our breastplate, the hope of salvation as our helmet, by keeping "the sword of the Spirit" bright with exercise, "praying with all prayer," standing near our Captain, looking to him, relying upon him, knowing that "without him we can do nothing,"—so must we fight! All this is necessary, if we would overcome.

It is not so easy to fight this fight as some suppose. It is not a true faith merely, an evangelical creed, a scriptural church, a comfortable sermon once or twice a week, a little Sabbath-keeping, an agreeable pause in your pleasures, giving to them a new relish—it is not this which constitutes Christianity. You that think religion so very easy a thing, have a care lest, when too late, you find that you knew not what true religion meant.

Easy? A depraved being to trample upon his lusts—a proud being to lie prostrate with humility and self-reproach—they that are "slow of heart to believe," to receive the Gospel as little children?

Easy? To "crucify the flesh," "to deny ungodliness," "to cut off a right hand, and to pluck out a right eye?"

Easy? To be in the world, and yet not of the world—to come out from it, not by the seclusion of the cloister, but by holiness of life—to be diligent in its duties, yet not absorbed

by them; appreciating its innocent delights, and yet not ensnared by them; beholding its attractions, and yet rising superior to them?

Easy? To live surrounded by objects which appeal to the sight, and yet to endure as seeing what is invisible?

Easy? To pray and see no answer to prayer, and still pray on—to fight this battle, and find fresh foes ever rising up, yet still to fight on—to be harassed with doubts and fears, and yet walk on in darkness, though we see no light, staying ourselves upon God?

Easy? To be preparing for a world we have never visited, in opposition to so much that is captivating in a world where we have always dwelt, whose beauties we have seen, whose music we have heard, whose pleasures we have experienced?

Easy? To resist that subtle foe who has cast down so many of the wise and the mighty?

Easy? When Jesus says it is a “strait gate,” and that if we would enter we must “strive,” bidding us “take up our cross daily, deny ourselves and follow him?” Ah! it is no soft flowery meadow, along which we may languidly stroll, but a rough, craggy cliff that we must climb. “To him that overcometh!” It is no smooth, placid stream, along which we may dreamily float, but a tempestuous ocean we must stem. “To him that overcometh!” It is no easy lolling in a cushioned chariot, that bears us on without fatigue and peril. The trumpet has sounded to arms; it is not peace, but war, war for liberty, war for life, on the issue of which our everlasting destiny depends! If we are to be saved, we must “overcome.”

But though the conflict is arduous, the encouragements are great. We have armor of proof. We have a mighty Cham-

pion. Victory is ensured to the brave. Others who stood on the same battle-field and fought with the same enemies, are now enjoying an eternal triumph. Not one faithful warrior ever perished. Their foes were not fewer than ours, their strength was not greater. They overcame by the same “blood of the Lamb” on which we rely.

“Once they were mourning here below,  
And wet their couch with tears;  
They wrestled hard, as we do now,  
With sins, and doubts, and fears.”

But they are wearing their crowns, they are enjoying their rest; and the feeblest and most unworthy of our own day, trusting in the same Saviour, shall inherit the same promise. Then let us overcome. Sheathe not the sword, and it shall never be wrested from you; lay not down the shield, and no fiery dart shall ever penetrate it; face the foe, and he shall never trample you down, never drive you back.

Listen to your Captain; how he animates you onward! Look to the crown he is ready to bestow upon you; eat of the hidden manna which he gives; read the name in the “white stone,”—the name of God,—his name of love, recorded for your encouragement; and thus be animated to walk worthy of this holy alliance, and not to allow the foe to wrench from you such an assurance of divine favor, such a passport to heavenly bliss.

A little more conflict, and that “white stone” shall introduce you to the inheritance above, where, in the everlasting repose of the inner sanctuary, you shall without intermission eat of the hidden manna.

“Then let my soul march boldly on,  
Press forward to the heavenly gate;  
There peace and joy eternal reign,  
And glittering robes for conquerors wait.”

Some of you may consider this subject visionary and unreal. You say, "I know nothing of this warfare. I know what the conflict of business is, the race of fashion, the bustle of toil or pleasure; but to anxiety about spiritual things I am a stranger."

You are enjoying peace—but—what peace? There is a captive in a dungeon—his limbs are fast chained to the walls—yet he is singing songs. How is it? Satan has given him to drink of his drugged cup, and he does not know where he is. Look at that other. He says, "it is peace." There is truly no fighting, but he is grovelling in the dust, and the heel of his foe is upon his neck. Such is the peace of every one going on in his wickedness, unpardoned and unsaved. "Taken captive by the devil at his will."

Chained in Satan's boat, you are swiftly gliding down the stream to ruin, and because it is smooth, you dream that it is safe! What is the difference between the saint and the sinner? Not that in the saint there is no sin. Not that in the sinner there is never a thought about God. The difference is this—that the saint is overcoming his sin; but the sin is overcoming the sinner. O, what a terrible thing if sin have the upper hand! No "hidden manna" is yours. The symbols of religion you may look at, but real religion must be a stranger to you. You know not its enjoyment. You do not taste it. It is a hidden thing. Heaven too will be hidden. You hear of its gates of pearl—but they will never open to you. You may catch the distant accents of its songs—but in those songs you will never join. And that "white stone" cannot be yours. You have no joyful anticipation of heaven—but a fearful looking-for of fiery indignation—or else the insensate resolve not to think at all. And the "new name"—no! you cannot read it! You know God by

no such name as makes you seek his company. The thought of him renders you unhappy, and therefore you banish it from your mind. You are not now alarmed, but soon the spell may be broken, and you may find the chains riveted upon your soul forever.

I fancy I hear you say, "I wish that before it is too late, I could escape! But mine is a hopeless case. My heart is hardened against the Gospel, and evil habit has so got the mastery over me, that I have no power to begin this conflict!"

No, you have no power; but One has visited this world, and taken our nature, who can help you. The mighty Son of God became the suffering Son of Man, that he might be the Liberator of our enslaved race. He burst open the prison doors, that captive souls might escape. He stands near you, ready to break off your fetters and strengthen you to fight the enemy who has so long oppressed you. Tell him your simple but sad tale; how helpless, how miserable, how ruined you are! Tell him you want to be saved, but know not how to begin the work, and ask him both to begin and complete it for you! Let your prayer be this: "Be merciful to me a sinner;" and he who "came to destroy the works of the devil," he "whose nature and property is ever to have mercy and to forgive," will receive your "humble petitions; and though you be tied and bound with the chain of your sins, he, in the pitifulness of his great mercy, will loose you."

He will pardon your past shameful concessions to the foe, and, arraying you in "the whole armor of God," and animating you with his Holy Spirit, he will enable you so to fight against the world, the flesh, and the devil, that you also shall share in the prize of them that overcome; you also shall eat of the "hidden manna," and receive the "white stone."

# HENRY L. DAWES



HENRY LAURENS DAWES, American politician and congressman from Massachusetts, was born at Cummington, Mass., Oct. 30, 1816, and was educated at Yale University. He studied law and, after admittance to the Bar in 1842, began to practice at North Adams, in his native State, removing in 1864, to Pittsfield, Mass. He served in the State legislature from 1848 to 1852, and, entering Congress as representative in 1857, was soon active in anti-slavery legislation. In 1875, he succeeded Sumner in the United States Senate and was a prominent member of that body until 1893, when he declined renomination. During his congressional career he served on innumerable committees and was conspicuous in legislative action on the tariff and other important topics. To Mr. Dawes is due the establishment, in 1869, of the "Weather Bulletin," that useful indicator of the probabilities and predictions as to coming storms, etc. He is the author also of the Severalty Bill, the Sioux Bill, and the measure that makes the Indians subject to the United States criminal laws and places them under United States protection.

## ON THE INDIAN POLICY

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES APRIL 5, 1880

NO tribe of Indians ever entered into a treaty with the United States that did not result in putting fetters upon them. They have been lassoed into imprisonment and confinement within limits that the necessities of growth in this government required, and no sooner have we made treaties than we have gone to work deliberately to violate them.

But it is not treaty obligations alone of which the Indian has to complain. Why, sir, the treatment of the Indian agents, and the army, and the whole department, with the Indian for long back is covered with blots, and stains, and bad faith, and aggravations to the Indian, and provocation to violence on his part.

While we have been deliberating over this very measure  
(124)

in our committee on Indian affairs, a peaceable Indian chief who never raised his hand in violence upon a white man, whose home had been ceded to him by words of grant on the part of the United States as solemn and effective as a warranty deed, in consideration of his good behavior and peaceable deportment toward the United States — this is the language of the grant — who had been driven at the point of the bayonet from that home into the malaria of the Indian Territory, has there been enticed by false pretences into the Indian agent's own house, an agent of this modern civilization, and there shot down upon the floor in cold and cowardly murder by the soldiers of the United States under the direction of an Indian agent.

Sir, the Northern Cheyennes, taken by the army from their home and the graves of their fathers among the cool mountain streams of the Northwest, down to the torrid jungles and malaria of the Indian Territory, there to fall before the ravages of disease, when they broke away and wandered through the wilds of western Kansas seeking their old home, were taken by the armed soldiers of the United States and shut up in midwinter, in January, in a guard-house, when the thermometer was ten degrees below zero, without clothing to protect them from the inclemency of the weather. They were told by the officer whose official report I have here, "You shall have neither food nor drink nor fuel till you consent to go back to your doom in the Indian Territory," and there they were kept without either food or fuel or drink four or five days — the officer reports four, the Indians say it was seven — in what the officer calls "the freezing-out process." And then, when the chief was called out of the guard-room under pretence of a conference, armed soldiers were placed in side-rooms, out of sight, and when he and his fellows came into a

room for a peaceable conference they were seized and put in irons, and those in the guard-house breaking out with the resolution to die in flight for their homes rather than to die in the Indian Territory the victims of disease, were fired upon with shot and shell and every male member of the band but those in irons and two others, with thirty women and children, were laid corpses in the process.

Sir, I have before me the process pursued toward men supposed to be guilty of the murder of a young man from Massachusetts upon a stage route in Arizona. When an officer of the army called the Indians into council, having previously arranged with a half-breed that like Judas he should go among his brethren and betray the men he was willing to say were guilty, and when that process was gone through with, under the pretence of a council with friendly Indians, soldiers at a given signal shot them all dead.

Does anybody wonder, when these instances multiply around us every day, when flags of truce, like that under which General Canby fell at the hands of the Modocs, are violated by our own soldiers when they treat with the Indians; when the whole history of the dispensing of the Indian annuities and of the Indian appropriations is one long history of plunder; when we make our promises with no apparent intention of keeping them,—is it to be wondered at that the Indian question has come upon us with difficulties almost passing solution?

Sir, before we can do anything toward making something out of the Indian we must do justice to him. The process of extermination, I think, is substantially abandoned by our people. It has proved a failure, at least, with all the advantages under which it has been tried and the fidelity with which it has been pursued: sparing no expense of Indian warfare or

cruel treatment, transferring the Indian from place to place, taking him from the cold regions of the north to the almost inhospitable and uninhabitable regions of the Indian Territory, there to die by hundreds; still the truth stares us in the face that there are more of them to-day than there were yesterday.

Take the Poncas, who lived upon a reservation the title to which was a grant, in so many words, from the United States, in which it was recited that it was in consideration of two things: first, of a like grant on the part of the Poncas to the United States, and next, of their long, peaceable, and quiet life and demeanor towards the United States. Take them and follow their band of eight hundred men, driven by soldiers into the Indian Territory, and falling down in the process and in the acclimation to four hundred and eighty-four, or about that number; yet it is true that within the last year, since they have come to be acclimated and taken care of, there are more of them than there were when the year began. So it is true of them all. And, sir, that policy pursued so faithfully has got to be abandoned, and I thank God that it has.

Then we have to deal with these Indians by some other process. Another process is like that shadowed forth in the argument of the senator from Alabama, that we shall violently break up their tribal relations and scatter them, wild and savage and uneducated, abroad in the community; subject to the laws and enjoying all the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States, having no other restraint upon them than the feeble and ineffectual restraint that comes from bringing them into a court of justice to plead to an indictment they cannot understand for the violation of a law they do not know the meaning of.

Sir, the senator from Colorado [Mr. Teller] well described the strength of the cords which bind the Indians to their bands. I venture to say there is not power enough in the United States to violently and against their will rend those cords. They are the ties of family, and kindred, and blood, as strong in the savage as in the civilized man, and stronger, perhaps, in some respects. If there were no question of humanity in it, it is an impossibility. You cannot with an army larger in number than all the bands themselves rend asunder by violence those cords and attachments which bind them one to another in families, any more than you could invade the homes of the civilized, scatter them and think vainly that thereby you had broken asunder all the ties that bind man to his family and to his kindred.

You may give up, then, Mr. President, all attempts thus to disintegrate and separate from their clans and their tribes the two hundred and fifty thousand Indians you have upon your hands and are obliged to feed by daily rations and clothe as you do your soldiers. You can neither exterminate them, nor can you violently separate and scatter them in the community and expect that you can make citizens of them. If you did it you would have two hundred and fifty thousand people gathering in the western States more than in the eastern, for they would not trouble us, but you might just as well turn loose the inmates of an insane asylum and impose upon them the restraints of law and require at their hands obedience to the obligations of citizenship as to undertake by this process to make citizens,— self-supporting, obedient to the law of the land,— of these Indians.

Then, sir, if you can neither exterminate them nor by the puny, ineffectual attempt at an enactment here at your desk, disintegrate and scatter them around through the forty-five

millions of people we have here in this land, what next? Sir, you ought to improve them, make something of them, undertake to relieve yourselves of this burden which comes upon you as a just retribution for the long line of treatment in the past which finds no justification in any standard of justice, or of the right between the powerful and the weak. No one expects that you can make much out of the adult Indians. You cannot teach them much how to work and support themselves. Industrious habits do not come by the force of enactments. Industrious habits are the result of long years of training, beginning with early life.

You have, them, too, without the ability to speak our language, to understand those with whom they are obliged to treat daily in order to obtain the merest necessities of life. Take one of them, allot him in severalty, which seems now to be the panacea for all evils, one hundred and sixty acres of land, and surround him, as this bill and the other proposes, with the enterprising western pioneer who purchases the real estate, the one hundred and sixty acres on each side of him, and what then? He goes out to support himself. He cannot understand his neighbor. He only knows from sad experience, because he cannot forget that he never treats with that color without having the worst of it. How long would he live and support himself?

I had an interesting conversation a few days since with a chief of one of these tribes, as intellectual a man, as clear-headed, and as honest and truthful a man, according to the department and everybody else, as any one could be; a man who realized the condition of the Indians, a man who made it a study as well as he could, of what, so far as his tribe was concerned, was the best solution of this question. I asked him if he could have for each male member of his tribe one

hundred and sixty acres of land allotted in severalty with the condition that it could not be alienated for twenty-five years, what he would say to that. It was a great while before he could be made to comprehend what I meant, with an earnest desire to understand the full meaning of these words; and when at last he seemed fully to comprehend them, shaking his head, he said, "It would not do us any good; it might our children; but we do not understand your language; we do not know how to treat with white men; they always get the better of us; they would pluck us as you do a bird."

Then I put the question in another form: "Suppose you were so allotted, and a good, honest Indian agent"—my friend from Illinois [Mr. Davis] almost laughs when I say that—"a good, honest Indian agent were put over you to keep off the white people and let you develop yourselves?"

"We don't know how to work very well; we were never taught to work; if our children could be brought up to understand your language and to understand what comes of work, to understand that what they earned to-day is theirs, and they can hold it against the world, they could take these lands and they could take care of themselves and of us, but we cannot do it."

There is more philosophy in that Indian's statement of the question than all that has been developed in the Indian policy of the government for the last quarter of a century. Take their children; above all take their girls into schools in which they may be taught the English language and English ways and English habits and ideas. They bring up the families; they take care of the children; from them the children learn to talk and learn to think and learn to act; and yet, in all the schools established in Indian agencies for the education of the Indians, the Indian girl is hardly thought of. Take the boy

and make something of him; not keep him till he forgets his race and his parentage, but keep him until there shall be inspired in him a missionary spirit to go forth among those of his blood and attempt to make something of them.

Appropriate this \$125,000 which in this bill you pledge yourselves to distribute every year *per capita* around among these people, to the education each year of these four thousand Ute Indians, and by the time this experiment shall have failed and the Indian question, so far as Colorado is concerned, shall have come back upon us with increased force, you will have raised up among those Indians a restraining and at the same time an elevating influence that shall quicken in the whole tribe a desire to acquire, and with it shall come also the desire to protect and keep their daily earnings; and with that comes the necessity and the desire for peace, and with peace comes respect for law, and that is the simple natural process and the only one, it seems to me, Mr. President, which opens up to us with any hope of success.

It is a long and tedious process out of this difficulty; it is beset with embarrassments and discouragements on every side; but those who understand best and appreciate more fully than I do all these difficulties have themselves the strongest confidence in its ultimate success. Certainly, sir, these puny efforts on the part of the government to deal with the Indian question, these homeopathic doses, are idle and are folly in the extreme. If I could see any good to come from this bill, recognizing as I do the imperative necessity of action in respect to these Utes, recognizing as I am free to do the earnest desire on the part of the Indian department to do the best possible thing, I should like to support it. I know that with great propriety and with necessity the department turns to Congress; for it is Congress, and Congress alone, that can solve

this question; but I fear that by no such processes as those we are considering to-day, involving as they do (and which I do not think the Senate quite realize) an enormous expenditure of public moneys with so little in return, can the great result I desire be accomplished.

# FREDERICK DOUGLASS



FREDERICK DOUGLASS, a noted American orator and journalist, was born about the year 1817 a slave, the son of a white father and African mother, in Tuckahoe, Md., and died near Washington, D. C., Feb. 20, 1895. At about the age of ten he was sent to Baltimore to live with one of his master's relatives and after a time found work in a shipyard, having by this time learned to read and write. In 1838, he escaped from slavery and fled to New Bedford, Mass., where he resided for several years, and was aided in his efforts at self-education by William Lloyd Garrison. At an anti-slavery convention in Nantucket, in 1841, he delivered a speech that was so much admired that he was made the agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, and for four years lectured to large audiences throughout New England. He then proceeded to Europe for two years on behalf of the anti-slavery cause, and while there his freedom was purchased by his English friends. For some years subsequent to his return to this country he edited at Rochester, N. Y., the "North Star," a weekly journal, and in 1870 became editor of the "New National Era" at Washington. He was appointed assistant secretary of the Santo Domingo Commission in 1871, and in the following year was presidential elector at large for New York State. He held the post of United States marshal of the District of Columbia (1876-81), and recorder of deeds for the District for the next five years. In 1888-89, he was United States Minister resident and consul-general at Haiti. Douglass was a man of prepossessing appearance, good manners, and a pleasing style of delivery. His orations exhibited refinement of language as well as grace of expression. Beside his orations and addresses, he was the author of "Narrative of My Experiences in Slavery" (1844); "My Bondage and My Freedom" (1855); and of an autobiography, "Life and Times of Frederick Douglass from 1817 to 1882" (1882).

## WHAT THE BLACK MAN WANTS

DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS  
ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY AT BOSTON, 1865

M R. PRESIDENT,—I came here, as I come always to the meetings in New England, as a listener, and not as a speaker; and one of the reasons why I have not been more frequently to the meetings of this society, has been because of the disposition on the part of some of my friends to call me out upon the platform, even when they knew that there was some difference of opinion and of feeling between those

who rightfully belong to this platform and myself; and for fear of being misconstrued, as desiring to interrupt or disturb the proceedings of these meetings, I have usually kept away, and have thus been deprived of that educating influence, which I am always free to confess is of the highest order, descending from this platform. I have felt, since I have lived out West, that in going there I parted from a great deal that was valuable; and I feel, every time I come to these meetings, that I have lost a great deal by making my home west of Boston, west of Massachusetts; for, if anywhere in the country there is to be found the highest sense of justice, or the truest demands for my race, I look for it in the East, I look for it here. The ablest discussions of the whole question of our rights occur here, and to be deprived of the privilege of listening to those discussions is a great deprivation.

I do not know, from what has been said, that there is any difference of opinion as to the duty of Abolitionists, at the present moment. How can we get up any difference at this point, or at any point, where we are so united, so agreed? I went, especially, however, with that word of Mr. Phillips, which is the criticism of General Banks and General Banks's policy. I hold that that policy is our chief danger at the present moment; that it practically enslaves the negro, and makes the proclamation of 1863 a mockery and delusion. What is freedom? It is the right to choose one's own employment. Certainly it means that, if it means anything; and when any individual or combination of individuals undertakes to decide for any man when he shall work, where he shall work, at what he shall work, and for what he shall work, he or they practically reduce him to slavery. He is a slave. That I understand General Banks to do — to determine for the so-called freedman, when, and where, and at what, and

for how much he shall work, when he shall be punished, and by whom punished. It is absolute slavery. It defeats the beneficent intentions of the government, if it has beneficent intentions, in regard to the freedom of our people.

I have had but one idea for the last three years to present to the American people, and the phraseology in which I clothe it is the old abolition phraseology. I am for the "immediate, unconditional, and universal" enfranchisement of the black man, in every State in the Union. Without this, his liberty is a mockery; without this, you might as well almost retain the old name of slavery for his condition; for, in fact, if he is not the slave of the individual master, he is the slave of society, and holds his liberty as a privilege, not as a right. He is at the mercy of the mob, and has no means of protecting himself.

It may be objected, however, that this pressing of the negro's right to suffrage is premature. Let us have slavery abolished, it may be said, let us have labor organized, and then, in the natural course of events, the right of suffrage will be extended to the negro. I do not agree with this. The constitution of the human mind is such, that if it once disregards the conviction forced upon it by a revelation of truth, it requires the exercise of a higher power to produce the same conviction afterward. The American people are now in tears. The Shenandoah has run blood, the best blood of the North. All around Richmond, the blood of New England and of the North has been shed, of your sons, your brothers, and your fathers. We all feel, in the existence of this rebellion, that judgments terrible, widespread, far-reaching, overwhelming, are abroad in the land; and we feel, in view of these judgments, just now, a disposition to learn righteousness. This is the hour. Our streets are in mourning, tears are falling at

every fireside, and under the chastisement of this rebellion we have almost come up to the point of conceding this great, this all-important right of suffrage. I fear that if we fail to do it now, if Abolitionists fail to press it now, we may not see, for centuries to come, the same disposition that exists at this moment. Hence, I say, now is the time to press this right.

It may be asked, "Why do you want it? Some men have got along very well without it. Women have not this right." Shall we justify one wrong by another? That is a sufficient answer. Shall we at this moment justify the deprivation of the negro of the right to vote, because some one else is deprived of that privilege? I hold that women, as well as men, have the right to vote, and my heart and my voice go with the movement to extend suffrage to woman; but that question rests upon another basis than that on which our right rests. We may be asked, I say, why we want it. I will tell you why we want it. We want it because it is our right, first of all. No class of men can, without insulting their own nature, be content with any deprivation of their rights. We want it, again, as a means for educating our race. Men are so constituted that they derive their conviction of their own possibilities largely from the estimate formed of them by others. If nothing is expected of a people, that people will find it difficult to contradict that expectation. By depriving us of suffrage, you affirm our incapacity to form an intelligent judgment respecting public men and public measures; you declare before the world that we are unfit to exercise the elective franchise, and by this means lead us to undervalue ourselves, to put a low estimate upon ourselves, and to feel that we have no possibilities like other men. Again, I want the elective franchise, for one, as a colored man, because ours is a peculiar government, based upon a peculiar idea, and that

idea is universal suffrage. If I were in a monarchical government, or an autocratic or aristocratic government, where the few bore rule and the many were subject, there would be no special stigma resting upon me, because I did not exercise the elective franchise. It would do me no great violence. Mingle with the mass, I should partake of the strength of the mass; I should be supported by the mass, and I should have the same incentives to endeavor with the mass of my fellow men; it would be no particular burden, no particular deprivation; but here, where universal suffrage is the rule, where that is the fundamental idea of the government, to rule us out is to make us an exception, to brand us with the stigma of inferiority, and to invite to our heads the missiles of those about us; therefore, I want the franchise for the black man.

There are, however, other reasons, not derived from any consideration merely of our rights, but arising out of the condition of the South, and of the country; considerations which have already been referred to by Mr. Phillips; considerations which must arrest the attention of statesmen. I believe that when the tall heads of this rebellion shall have been swept down, as they will be swept down, when the Davises and Toombses and Stephenses, and others who are leading in this rebellion shall have been blotted out, there will be this rank undergrowth of treason, to which reference has been made, growing up there, and interfering with, and thwarting the quiet operation of the federal government in those States. You will see those traitors handing down, from sire to son, the same malignant spirit which they have manifested, and which they are now exhibiting, with malicious hearts, broad blades, and bloody hands in the field, against our sons and brothers. That spirit will still remain; and whoever sees the federal government extended over those southern States will

see that government in a strange land, and not only in a strange land, but in an enemy's land. A postmaster of the United States in the South will find himself surrounded by a hostile spirit; a collector in a southern port will find himself surrounded by a hostile spirit; a United States marshal or United States judge will be surrounded there by a hostile element. That enmity will not die out in a year, will not die out in an age. The federal government will be looked upon in those States precisely as the governments of Austria and France are looked upon in Italy at the present moment. They will endeavor to circumvent, they will endeavor to destroy, the peaceful operation of this government. Now, where will you find the strength to counterbalance this spirit, if you do not find it in the negroes of the South? They are your friends, and have always been your friends. They were your friends even when the government did not regard them as such. They comprehended the genius of this war before you did. It is a significant fact, it is a marvellous fact, it seems almost to imply a direct interposition of Providence, that this war, which began in the interest of slavery on both sides, bid fair to end in the interest of liberty on both sides. It was begun, I say, in the interest of slavery on both sides. The South was fighting to take slavery out of the Union, and the North fighting to keep it in the Union; the South fighting to get it beyond the limits of the United States constitution, and the North fighting to retain it within those limits; the South fighting for new guarantees, and the North fighting for the old guarantees; both despising the negro, both insulting the negro. Yet, the negro, apparently endowed with wisdom from on high, saw more clearly the end from the beginning than we did. When Seward said the status of no man in the country would be changed by the war, the negro did not be-

lieve him. When our generals sent their underlings in shoulder-straps to hunt the flying negro back from our lines into the jaws of slavery, from which he had escaped, the negroes thought that a mistake had been made, and that the intentions of the government had not been rightly understood by our officers in shoulder-straps, and they continued to come into our lines, treading their way through bogs and fens, over briars and thorns, fording streams, swimming rivers, bringing us tidings as to the safe path to march, and pointing out the dangers that threatened us. They are our only friends in the South, and we should be true to them in this their trial hour, and see to it that they have the elective franchise.

I know that we are inferior to you in some things, virtually inferior. We walk about among you like dwarfs among giants. Our heads are scarcely seen above the great sea of humanity. The Germans are superior to us; the Irish are superior to us; the Yankees are superior to us; they can do what we cannot, that is, what we have not hitherto been allowed to do. But while I make this admission, I utterly deny that we are originally, or naturally, or practically, or in any way, or in any important sense, inferior to anybody on this globe. This charge of inferiority is an old dodge. It has been made available for oppression on many occasions. It is only about six centuries since the blue-eyed and fair-haired Anglo-Saxons were considered inferior by the haughty Normans, who once trampled upon them. If you read the history of the Norman Conquest, you will find that this proud Anglo-Saxon was once looked upon as of coarser clay than his Norman master, and might be found in the highways and byways of Old England laboring with a brass collar on his neck, and the name of his master marked upon it. You were down then!

You are up now. I am glad you are up, and I want you to be glad to help us up also.

The story of our inferiority is an old dodge, as I have said; for wherever men oppress their fellows, wherever they enslave them, they will endeavor to find the needed apology for such enslavement and oppression in the character of the people oppressed and enslaved. When we wanted, a few years ago, a slice of Mexico, it was hinted that the Mexicans were an inferior race, that the old Castilian blood had become so weak that it would scarcely run down hill, and that Mexico needed the long, strong, and beneficent arm of the Anglo-Saxon race extended over it. We said that it was necessary to its salvation, and a part of the "manifest destiny" of this Republic, to extend our arm over that dilapidated government. So, too, when Russia wanted to take possession of a part of the Ottoman Empire, the Turks were "an inferior race." So, too, when England wants to set the heel of her power more firmly in the quivering heart of Old Ireland, the Celts are an "inferior race." So, too, the negro, when he is to be robbed of any right which is justly his, is an "inferior man." It is said that we are ignorant. I admit it. But if we know enough to be hung, we know enough to vote. If the negro knows enough to pay taxes to support the government, he knows enough to vote; taxation and representation should go together. If he knows enough to shoulder a musket and fight for the flag, fight for the government, he knows enough to vote. If he knows as much when he is sober as an Irishman knows when drunk, he knows enough to vote, on good American principles.

But I was saying that you needed a counterpoise, in the persons of the slaves to the enmity that would exist at the South after the rebellion is put down. I hold that

the American people are bound, not only in self-defence, to extend this right to the freedmen of the South, but they are bound by their love of country, and by all their regard for the future safety of those southern States, to do this—to do it as a measure essential to the preservation of peace there. But I will not dwell upon this. I put it to the American sense of honor. The honor of a nation is an important thing. It is said in the Scriptures, "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" It may be said, also, What doth it profit a nation if it gain the whole world, but lose its honor? I hold that the American government has taken upon itself a solemn obligation of honor, to see that this war, let it be long or let it be short, let it cost much or let it cost little, that this war shall not cease until every freedman at the South has the right to vote. It has bound itself to it. What have you asked the black men of the South, the black men of the whole country to do? Why, you have asked them to incur the deadly enmity of their masters, in order to befriend you and to befriend this government. You have asked us to call down, not only upon ourselves, but upon our children's children, the deadly hate of the entire Southern people. You have called upon us to turn our backs upon our masters, to abandon their cause and espouse yours; to turn against the South and in favor of the North; to shoot down the Confederacy and uphold the flag—the American flag. You have called upon us to expose ourselves to all the subtle machinations of their malignity for all time. And now, what do you propose to do when you come to make peace? To reward your enemies, and trample in the dust your friends? Do you intend to sacrifice the very men who have come to the rescue of your banner in the South, and incurred the lasting displeas-

ure of their masters thereby? Do you intend to sacrifice them and reward your enemies? Do you mean to give your enemies the right to vote, and take it away from your friends? Is that wise policy? Is that honorable? Could American honor withstand such a blow? I do not believe you will do it. I think you will see to it that we have the right to vote. There is something too mean in looking upon the negro, when you are in trouble, as a citizen, and when you are free from trouble, as an alien. When this nation was in trouble, in its early struggles, it looked upon the negro as a citizen. In 1776 he was a citizen. At the time of the formation of the constitution the negro had the right to vote in eleven States out of the old thirteen. In your trouble you have made us citizens. In 1812 General Jackson addressed us as citizens — “fellow citizens.” He wanted us to fight. We were citizens then! And now, when you come to frame a conscription bill, the negro is a citizen again. He has been a citizen just three times in the history of this government, and it has always been in time of trouble. In time of trouble we are citizens. Shall we be citizens in war, and aliens in peace? Would that be just?

I ask my friends who are apologizing for not insisting upon this right, where can the black man look in this country for the assertion of this right, if he may not look to the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society? Where under the whole heavens can he look for sympathy, in asserting this right, if he may not look to this platform? Have you lifted us up to a certain height to see that we are men, and then are any disposed to leave us there, without seeing that we are put in possession of all our rights? We look naturally to this platform for the assertion of all our rights, and for this one especially. I understand the anti-slavery societies of this country to be

based on two principles,—first, the freedom of the blacks of this country; and, second, the elevation of them. Let me not be misunderstood here. I am not asking for sympathy at the hands of Abolitionists, sympathy at the hands of any. I think the American people are disposed often to be generous rather than just. I look over this country at the present time, and I see educational societies, sanitary commissions, freedmen's associations and the like,—all very good: but in regard to the colored people there is always more that is benevolent, I perceive, than just, manifested towards us. What I ask for the negro is not benevolence, not pity, not sympathy, but simply justice. The Ameriean people have always been anxious to know what they shall do with us. General Banks was distressed with solicitude as to what he should do with the negro. Everybody has asked the question, and they learned to ask it early of the Abolitionists, "What shall we do with the negro?" I have had but one answer from the beginning. Do nothing with us! Your doing with us has already played the mischief with us. Do nothing with us! If the apples will not remain on the tree of their own strength, if they are worm-eaten at the core, if they are early ripe and disposed to fall, let them fall! I am not for tying or fastening them on the tree in any way, except by nature's plan, and if they will not stay there, let them fall. And if the negro cannot stand on his own legs, let him fall also. All I ask is, give him a chance to stand on his own legs! Let him alone! If you see him on his way to school, let him alone,—don't disturb him! If you see him going to the dinner table at a hotel, let him go! If you see him going to the ballot-box, let him alone,—don't disturb him! If you see him going into a workshop, just let him alone,—your interference is doing him a positive injury.

General Banks's "preparation" is of a piece with this attempt to prop up the negro. Let him fall if he cannot stand alone! If the negro cannot live by the line of eternal justice, so beautifully pictured to you in the illustration used by Mr. Phillips, the fault will not be yours, it will be his who made the negro, and established that line for his government. Let him live or die by that. If you will only untie his hands, and give him a chance, I think he will live. He will work as readily for himself as the white man. A great many delusions have been swept away by this war. One was, that the negro would not work; he has proved his ability to work. Another was, that the negro would not fight; that he possessed only the most sheepish attributes of humanity; was a perfect lamb, or an "Uncle Tom;" disposed to take off his coat whenever required, fold his hands, and be whipped by anybody who wanted to whip him. But the war has proved that there is a great deal of human nature in the negro, and that "he will fight," as Mr. Quincy, our President, said, in earlier days than these, "when there is a reasonable probability of his whipping anybody."

---

### INAUGURATION OF THE FREEDMEN'S MEMORIAL MONUMENT TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN

DELIVERED AT WASHINGTON, APRIL 24, 1876

**F**RIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS,—I warmly congratulate you upon the highly interesting object which has caused you to assemble in such numbers and spirit as you have to-day. This occasion is in some respects remarkable. Wise and thoughtful men of our race, who shall come after us, and study the lessons of our history in the

United States, who shall survey the long and dreary space over which we have travelled, who shall count the links in the great chain of events by which we have reached our present position, will make a note of this occasion — they will think of it, and with a sense of manly pride and complacency.

I congratulate you also upon the very favorable circumstances in which we meet to-day. They are high, inspiring and uncommon. They lend grace, glory and significance to the object for which we have met. Nowhere else in this great country, with its uncounted towns and cities, uncounted wealth, and immeasurable territory extending from sea to sea, could conditions be found more favorable to the success of this occasion than here.

We stand to-day at the national centre to perform something like a national act, an act which is to go into history, and we are here where every pulsation of the national heart can be heard, felt, and reciprocated.

A thousand wires, fed with thought and winged with lightning, put us in instantaneous communication with the loyal and true men all over the country.

Few facts could better illustrate the vast and wonderful change which has taken place in our condition as a people than the fact of our assembling here for the purpose we have to-day. Harmless, beautiful, proper, and praiseworthy as this demonstration is, I cannot forget that no such demonstration would have been tolerated here twenty years ago. The spirit of slavery and barbarism, which still lingers to blight and destroy in some dark and distant parts of our country, would have made our assembling here to-day the signal and excuse for opening upon us all the flood-gates of wrath and violence. That we are here in peace to-day is a compliment and credit to American civilization, and a

prophecy of still greater national enlightenment and progress in the future.

I refer to the past not in malice, for this is no day for malice, but simply to place more distinctly in front the gratifying and glorious change which has come both to our white fellow citizens and ourselves, and to congratulate all upon the contrast between now and then, the new dispensation of freedom with its thousand blessings to both races, and the old dispensation of slavery with its ten thousand evils to both races — white and black. In view, then, of the past, the present, and the future, with the long and dark history of our bondage behind us, and with liberty, progress and enlightenment before us, I again congratulate you upon this auspicious day and hour.

Friends and fellow citizens: The story of our presence here is soon and easily told. We are here in the District of Columbia; here in the city of Washington, the most luminous point of American territory — a city recently transformed and made beautiful in its body and in its spirit; we are here, in the place where the ablest and best men of the country are sent to devise the policy, enact the laws, and shape the destiny of the republic; we are here, with the stately pillars and majestic dome of the Capitol of the nation looking down upon us; we are here with the broad earth freshly adorned with the foliage and flowers of spring for our church, and all races, colors, and conditions of men for our congregation; in a word, we are here to express, as best we may, by appropriate forms and ceremonies, our grateful sense of the vast, high, and pre-eminent services rendered to ourselves, to our race, to our country, and to the whole world, by Abraham Lincoln.

The sentiment that brings us here to-day is one of the noblest that can stir and thrill the human heart. It has

crowned and made glorious the high places of all civilized nations, with the grandest and most enduring works of art, designed to illustrate characters and perpetuate the memories of great public men. It is a sentiment which from year to year adorns with fragrant and beautiful flowers the graves of our loyal, brave, and patriotic soldiers who fell in defence of the Union and liberty.

It is the sentiment of gratitude and appreciation, which often, in the presence of many who hear me, has filled yonder heights of Arlington with the eloquence of eulogy and the sublime enthusiasm of poetry and song; a sentiment which can never die while the republic lives.

For the first time in the history of our people, and in the history of the whole American people, we join in this high worship and march conspicuously in the line of this time-honored custom. First things are always interesting, and this is one of our first things. It is the first time that, in this form and manner, we have sought to do honor to any American great man, however deserving and illustrious. I commend the fact to notice.

Let it be told in every part of the republic; let men of all parties and opinions hear it; let those who despise us, not less than those who respect us, know that now and here, in the spirit of liberty, loyalty, and gratitude; let it be known everywhere and by everybody who takes an interest in human progress and in the amelioration of the condition of mankind, that in the presence and with the approval of the members of the American House of Representatives, reflecting the general sentiment of the country; that in the presence of that august body, the American Senate, representing the highest intelligence and the calmest judgment of the country; in presence of the supreme court and chief justice of the United States,

to whose decisions we all patriotically bow; in the presence and under the steady eye of the honored and trusted President of the United States, we, the colored people, newly emancipated and rejoicing in our blood-bought freedom, near the close of the first century in the life of this republic, have now and here unveiled, set apart, and dedicated a monument of enduring granite and bronze, in every line, feature, and figure of which the men of this generation may read — and those of after-coming generations may read — something of the exalted character and great works of Abraham Lincoln, the first martyr President of the United States.

Fellow citizens, in what we have said and done to-day, and in what we may say and do hereafter, we disclaim everything like arrogance and assumption. We claim for ourselves no superior devotion to the character, history, and memory of the illustrious name whose monument we have here dedicated to-day. We fully comprehend the relation of Abraham Lincoln both to ourselves and to the white people of the United States.

Truth is proper and beautiful at all times and in all places, and it is never more proper and beautiful in any case than when speaking of a great public man whose example is likely to be commended for honor and imitation long after his departure to the solemn shades, the silent continents of eternity. It must be admitted, truth compels me to admit, even here in the presence of the monument we have erected to his memory.

Abraham Lincoln was not, in the fullest sense of the word, either our man or our model. In his interest, in his associations, in his habits of thought, and in his prejudices, he was a white man. He was pre-eminently the white man's President, entirely devoted to the welfare of white men. He was ready and willing at any time during the first years of his adminis-

tration to deny, postpone, and sacrifice the rights of humanity in the colored people, to promote the welfare of the white people of this country. In all his education of feelings he was an American of the Americans.

He came into the presidential chair upon one principle alone, namely, opposition to the extension of slavery. His arguments in furtherance of this policy had their motive and mainspring in his patriotic devotion to the interests of his own race. To protect, defend, and perpetuate slavery in the States where it existed, Abraham Lincoln was not less ready than any other President to draw the sword of the nation.

He was ready to execute all the supposed constitutional guarantees of the constitution in favor of the slave system anywhere inside the slave States. He was willing to pursue, recapture, and send back the fugitive slave to his master, and to suppress a slave rising for liberty, though his guilty master were already in arms against the government. The race to which we belong were not the special objects of his consideration. Knowing this, I concede to you, my white fellow citizens, a pre-eminence in this worship at once full and supreme. First, midst, and last you and yours were the object of his deepest affection and his most earnest solicitude. You are the children of Abraham Lincoln. We are at best only his stepchildren, children by adoption, children by force of circumstances and necessity. To you it especially belongs to sound his praises, to preserve and perpetuate his memory, to multiply his statues, to hang his pictures on your walls, and commend his example, for to you he was a great and glorious friend and benefactor.

Instead of supplanting you at this altar we would exhort you to build high his monuments; let them be of the most costly material, of the most costly workmanship; let their

forms be symmetrical, beautiful, and perfect; let their bases be upon solid rocks, and their summits lean against the unchanging blue overhanging sky, and let them endure forever!

But while in the abundance of your wealth and in the fulness of your just and patriotic devotion you do all this, we entreat you to despise not the humble offering we this day unveil to view; for while Abraham Lincoln saved for you a country, he delivered us from a bondage, according to Jefferson, one hour of which was worse than ages of the oppression your fathers rose in rebellion to oppose.

Fellow citizens, ours is a new-born zeal and devotion, a thing of the hour. The name of Abraham Lincoln was near and dear to our hearts, in the darkest and most perilous hours of the republic. We were no more ashamed of him when shrouded in clouds of darkness, of doubt, and defeat than when crowned with victory, honor, and glory. Our faith in him was often taxed and strained to the uttermost, but it never failed. When he tarried long in the mountain; when he strangely told us that we were the cause of the war; when he still more strangely told us to leave the land in which we were born; when he refused to employ our arms in defence of the Union; when, after accepting our services as colored soldiers, he refused to retaliate when we were murdered as colored prisoners; when he told us he would save the Union if he could with slavery; when he revoked the proclamation of emancipation of General Fremont; when he refused to remove the commander of the Army of the Potomac, who was more zealous in his efforts to protect slavery than suppress rebellion; when we saw this, and more, we were at times stunned, grieved, and greatly bewildered; but our hearts believed while they ached and bled. Nor was this, even at that time,

a blind and unreasoning superstition. Despite the mist and haze that surrounded him; despite the tumult, the hurry, and confusion of the hour, we were able to take a comprehensive view of Abraham Lincoln, and to make reasonable allowance for the circumstances of his position.

We saw him, measured him, and estimated him; not by stray utterances to injudicious and tedious delegations, who often tried his patience; not by isolated facts torn from their connection; not by any partial and imperfect glimpses, caught at inopportune moments; but by a broad survey, in the light of the stern logic of great events: and, in view of "that divinity which shapes our ends, rough hew them as we will," we came to the conclusion that the hour and the man of our redemption had met in the person of Abraham Lincoln. It mattered little to us what language he might employ upon special occasions; it mattered little to us, when we fully knew him, whether he was swift or slow in his movements; it was enough for us that Abraham Lincoln was at the head of a great movement, and was in living and earnest sympathy with that movement which, in the nature of things, must go on till slavery should be utterly and forever abolished in the United States.

When, therefore, it shall be asked what we have to do with the memory of Abraham Lincoln, or what Abraham Lincoln had to do with us, the answer is ready, full, and complete. Though he loved Cæsar less than Rome, though the Union was more to him than our freedom or our future, under his wise and beneficent rule we saw ourselves gradually lifted from the depths of slavery to the heights of liberty and manhood; under his wise and beneficent rule, and by measures approved and vigorously pressed by him, we saw that the handwriting of ages, in the form of prejudice and proscription, was

rapidly fading away from the face of our whole country; under his rule, and in due time,— about as soon, after all, as the country could tolerate the strange spectacle,— we saw our brave sons and brothers laying off the rags of bondage, and being clothed all over in the blue uniforms of the soldiers of the United States; under his rule we saw two hundred thousand of our dark and dusky people responding to the call of Abraham Lincoln, and, with muskets on their shoulders and eagles on their buttons, timing their high footsteps to liberty and union under the national flag; under his rule we saw the independence of the black republic of Hayti, the special object of slaveholding aversion and horror, fully recognized, and her minister, a colored gentleman, duly received here in the city of Washington; under his rule we saw the internal slave trade which so long disgraced the nation abolished, and slavery abolished in the District of Columbia; under his rule we saw for the first time the law enforced against the foreign slave trade and the first slave-trader hanged, like any other pirate or murderer; under his rule and his inspiration we saw the Confederate States, based upon the idea that our race must be slaves, and slaves forever, battered to pieces and scattered to the four winds; under his rule, and in the fulness of time, we saw Abraham Lincoln, after giving the slaveholders three months of grace in which to save their hateful slave system, penning the immortal paper which, though special in its language, was general in its principles and effect, making slavery forever impossible in the United States.

Though we waited long we saw all this and more.

Can any colored man, or any white man friendly to the freedom of all men, ever forget the night which followed the first day of January, 1863? When the world was to see if Abraham Lincoln would prove to be as good as his word? I

shall never forget that memorable night, when in a distant city I waited and watched at a public meeting, with three thousand others not less anxious than myself, for the word of deliverance which we have heard read to-day. Nor shall I ever forget the outburst of joy and thanksgiving that rent the air when the lightning brought to us the emancipation. In that happy hour we forgot all delay, and forgot all tardiness, forgot that the President had bribed the rebels to lay down their arms by a promise to withhold the bolt which would smite the slave system with destruction; and we were thenceforward willing to allow the President all the latitude of time, phraseology, and every honorable device that statesmanship might require for the movement of a great and beneficent measure of liberty and progress.

Fellow citizens, there is little necessity on this occasion to speak at length and critically of this great and good man, and of his high mission in the world. That ground has been fully occupied and completely covered both here and elsewhere. The whole field of fact and fancy has been gleaned and garnered. Any man can say things that are true of Abraham Lincoln, but no man can say anything new of Abraham Lincoln. His personal traits and public acts are better known to the American people than are those of any other man of his age. He was a mystery to no man who saw and heard him. Though high in position, the humblest could approach him and feel at home in his presence. Though deep, he was transparent; though strong, he was gentle; though decided and pronounced in his convictions, he was tolerant toward those who differed from him, and patient under reproaches.

Even those who only knew him through his public utterances obtained a tolerably clear idea of his character and personality. The image of the man went out with his words,

and those who read him knew him. I have said that President Lincoln was a white man, and shared the prejudices common to his countrymen toward the colored race. Looking back to his times and to the condition of the country, this unfriendly feeling on his part may safely be set down as one element of his wonderful success in organizing the loyal American people for the tremendous conflict before them, and bringing them safely through that conflict.

His great mission was to accomplish two things; first, to save his country from dismemberment and ruin, and second, to free his country from the great crime of slavery. To do one or the other, or both, he must have the earnest sympathy and the powerful co-operation of his loyal fellow countrymen. Without this primary and essential condition to success, his efforts must have been vain and utterly fruitless. Had he put the abolition of slavery before the salvation of the Union, he would have inevitably driven from him a powerful class of American people, and have rendered resistance to rebellion impossible.

Viewed from the genuine abolition ground, Mr. Lincoln seemed tardy, cold, dull, and indifferent; but measuring him by the sentiment of his country, a sentiment he was bound as a statesman to consult, he was swift, zealous, radical, and determined. Though Mr. Lincoln shared the prejudices of his white fellow countrymen against the negro, it is hardly necessary to say that in his heart of hearts he loathed and hated slavery. He was willing while the South was loyal that it should have its pound of flesh, because he thought it was so nominated in the bond, but further than this no earthly power could make him go.

Fellow citizens, whatever else in this world may be partial, unjust, and uncertain, time! time! is impartial, just, and cer-

tain in its actions. In the realm of mind, as well as in the realm of matter, it is a great worker and often works wonders. The honest and comprehensive statesman, clearly discerning the needs of his country, and earnestly endeavoring to do his whole duty, though covered and blistered with reproaches, may safely leave his course to the silent judgment of time.

Few great public men have ever been the victims of fiercer denunciation than Abraham Lincoln was during his administration. He was often wounded in the house of his friends. Reproaches came thick and fast upon him from within and without, and from opposite quarters. He was assailed by Abolitionists; he was assailed by slaveholders; he was assailed by men who were for peace at any price; he was assailed by those who were for a more vigorous prosecution of the war; he was assailed for not making the war an abolition war; and he was most bitterly assailed for making the war an abolition war.

But now behold the change; the judgment of the present hour is, that taking him for all in all, measuring the tremendous magnitude of the work before him, considering the necessary means to ends, and surveying the end from the beginning, infinite wisdom has seldom sent any man into the world better fitted for his mission than was Abraham Lincoln.

His birth, his training, and his natural endowments, both mental and physical, were strongly in his favor. Born and reared among the lowly, a stranger to wealth and luxury, compelled to grapple single-handed with the flintiest hardships from tender youth to sturdy manhood, he grew strong in the manly and heroic qualities demanded by the great mission to which he was called by the votes of his countrymen. The hard condition of his early life, which would have depressed and broken down weaker men, only gave greater life, vigor,

and buoyancy to the heroic spirit of Abraham Lincoln. He was ready for any kind and quality of work. What other young men dreaded in the shape of toil, he took hold of with the utmost cheerfulness.

“A spade, a rake, a hoe,  
A pick-axe or a bill;  
A hook to reap, a scythe to mow,  
A flail, or what you will.”

All day long he could split heavy rails in the woods, and half the night long he could study his English grammar by the uncertain flare and glare of the light made by a pine knot. He was at home on the land with his axe, with his maul, with gluts and his wedges; and he was equally at home on water, with his oars, with his poles, with his planks, and with his boathooks. And whether in his flatboat on the Mississippi river, or at the fireside of his frontier cabin, he was a man of work. A son of toil himself, he was linked in brotherly sympathy with the sons of toil in every loyal part of the republic.

This very fact gave him tremendous power with the American people, and materially contributed not only to selecting him to the presidency, but in sustaining his administration of the government. Upon his inauguration as President of the United States, an office even where assumed under the most favorable conditions, it is fitted to tax and strain the largest abilities, Abraham Lincoln was met by a tremendous pressure. He was called upon not merely to administer the government, but to decide, in the face of terrible odds, the fate of the republic. A formidable rebellion rose in his path before him; the Union was already practically dissolved. His country was torn and rent asunder at the centre. Hostile enemies were already organized against the republic, armed with the munitions of war which the republic had provided for its own defence. The tremendous question for him to decide was

whether his country should survive the crisis and flourish or be dismembered and perish. His predecessor in office had already decided the question in favor of national dismemberment, by denying it the right of self-defence and self-preservation.

Happily for the country, happily for you and for me, the judgment of James Buchanan, the patrician, was not the judgment of Abraham Lincoln, the plebeian. He brought his strong common sense, sharpened in the school of adversity, to bear upon the question. He did not hesitate, he did not doubt, he did not falter, but at once resolved at whatever peril, at whatever cost, the union of the States should be preserved. A patriot himself, his faith was firm and unwavering in the patriotism of his countrymen.

Timid men said before Mr. Lincoln's inauguration that we had seen the last President of the United States. A voice in influential quarters said, Let the Union slide. Some said that a Union maintained by the sword was worthless. Others said, A rebellion of 8,000,000 cannot be suppressed. But in the midst of all this tumult and timidity, and against all this, Abraham Lincoln was clear in his duty, and had an oath in heaven. He calmly and bravely heard the voice of doubt and fear all around him, but he had an oath in heaven, and there was not power enough on earth to make this honest boatman, backwoodsman, and broad-handed splitter of rails evade or violate that sacred oath. He had not been schooled in the ethics of slavery; his plain life favored his love of truth. He had not been taught that treason and perjury were the proofs of honor and honesty. His moral training was against his saying one thing when he meant another. The trust which Abraham Lincoln had of himself and in the people was surprising and grand, but it was also enlightened and well

founded. He knew the American people better than they knew themselves, and his truth was based upon this knowledge.

Had Abraham Lincoln died from any of the numerous ills to which flesh is heir; had he reached that good old age to which his vigorous constitution and his temperate habits gave promise; had he been permitted to see the end of his great work; had the solemn curtain of death come down but gradually, we should still have been smitten with a heavy grief and treasured his name lovingly. But dying as he did die, by the red hand of violence; killed, assassinated, taken off without warning, not because of personal hate, for no man who knew Abraham Lincoln could hate him, but because of his fidelity to Union and liberty, he is doubly dear to us and will be precious forever.

Fellow citizens, I end as I began, with congratulations. We have done a good work for our race to-day. In doing honor to the memory of our friend and liberator we have been doing highest honor to ourselves and those who come after us. We have been fastening ourselves to a name and fame imperishable and immortal. We have also been defending ourselves from a blighting slander. When now it shall be said that a colored man is soulless; that he has no appreciation of benefits or benefactors; when the foul reproach of ingratitude is hurled at us, and it is attempted to scourge us beyond the range of human brotherhood, we may calmly point to the monument we have this day erected to the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

# JOHN JAY

JOHN JAY, American diplomat and publicist, son of William Jay of anti-slavery fame, was born at New York, June 23, 1817, and died there May 5, 1894. He graduated at Columbia College in 1836, and was admitted to the Bar three years later, immediately becoming prominent in his antagonism to slavery. In 1847, he became secretary of the Irish Relief Committee, and was counsel for a number of fugitive slaves. He was active in the formation of the Republican party, at Syracuse, in September, 1855; and in 1866 and again in 1877 was president of the Union League. In 1869, he was appointed Minister to Austria, and was a resident of Vienna till 1875. Two years later, Secretary Sherman nominated him chairman of the so-called Jay Commission to overhaul the system of conducting business at the New York customhouse. In 1883, Governor Cleveland named him Republican member of the State civil service commission. He was interested in the American Geographical and Statistical Society, and was for many years manager and secretary of the New York Historical Society, as well as president of the Huguenot Society. Mr. Jay delivered a large number of speeches on emancipation and other public questions, and took an intelligent interest in church affairs as a member of the Protestant Episcopal body.

## AMERICA FREE—OR AMERICA SLAVE

DELIVERED AT BEDFORD, WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK,  
OCTOBER 8, 1856

LET US see, gentlemen, what this slave power is, which, trampling upon compacts and defying the constitution, controls the federal government and employs its army and its treasury to force slavery upon an unwilling people. . . . .

Discarding for the present all those considerations of right and justice which instinctively occur to every right-minded person when slavery is mentioned—foregoing on this occasion all expression of sympathy for the millions of beating hearts that in the arithmetic of slavery count but as units under the sign of dollars—dispensing with aught that might

seem to savor of philanthropy, or, as some style it, fanaticism, and leaving the entire question of slavery in the States to the people of those States who, in the language of Mr. Faulkner of Virginia, "have a right to demand its extermination," let me direct your attention to the bearing of the question upon yourselves, to the direct, permanent, practical, and pecuniary interest which you and your children have in the rescue of Kansas from the grasp of slavery.

I need not remind you that slave labor and free labor are antagonistic. They cannot flourish, they hardly co-exist together. This fact was declared in the strongest terms by the ablest statesman of Virginia in the constitutional convention of 1830.

The hon. C. J. Faulkner said:

"Slavery is an institution which presses heavily against the best interests of the State. It banishes free white labor, it exterminates the mechanic, the artisan, the manufacturer; it deprives them of occupation, it deprives them of bread; it converts the energy of a community into indolence, its power into imbecility, its efficiency into weakness. Sir, being thus injurious, have we not a right to demand its extermination? Shall society suffer that the slaveholder may continue to gather his crop of human flesh? Must the country languish, droop, and die that the slaveholder may flourish?"

Shall all interests be subservient to one, all right subordinate to those of the slaveholder? Has not the mechanic, have not the middle classes their rights—rights incompatible with the interests of slavery?

The hon. T. J. Randolph:

"Slavery has the effect of lessening the free population of a country . . . Those who remain, relying upon the support of casual employment, often become more degraded in their condition than the slaves themselves."

The hon. James Marshall said:

“ Wherefore, then, object to slavery? Because it is ruinous to the whites, retards improvement, roots out an industrious population, banishes the yeomanry of the country, deprives the spinner, the weaver, the smith, the shoemaker, the carpenter of employment and support. The evil admits of no remedy; it is increasing, and will increase, until the whole country will be inundated by one black wave with a few white faces here and there floating on the surface. The master has no capital but what is invested in human flesh; the father, instead of being richer for his sons, is at a loss to provide for them. There is no diversity of occupation, no incentive to enterprise. Labor of every species is disreputable, because performed by slaves. Our towns are stationary, our villages everywhere declining and the general aspect of the country marks the course of a wasteful, idle, reckless population, who have no interest in the soil and care not how much it is impoverished.”

We may assume therefore that if Kansas is given up to slavery, it will be thereby closed to the better class of free-laborers not only of our own country, but of Europe. The great body of emigration westward-bound from our Atlantic States, never seeks and never will seek slave soil where not labor but the laborers themselves are bought and sold, and where labor is stripped of the dignity that belongs to it, and is treated with contempt.

Now look on the map blackened by slavery and you will see that Kansas is the key to the large territory lying to the west of it, the boundless regions of Utah and New Mexico, extending hundreds of miles till they meet the eastern boundary of California. Is it not clear that if we lose Kansas we shall in all probability lose not only the Indian Territory lying to the south of it, but those vast Territories stretching to the westward and large enough to make more than six States of the size of Pennsylvania? Governor Reeder, in a

speech at New York, put this grave question in the clearest light. He said:

“ With Kansas a slave State—and you will remember that Kansas is 900 miles long—I will thank any one to tell me how he is going to save the second, the third, or the fourth, each one further and further out of reach—each one with more slave States intervening.”

If Kansas is lost to freedom, those Territories are all lost. We are fighting the battle once for all. Now or never—now and forever.

Secure Kansas and all the blessings of freedom—free labor, free schools, free speech, a free press, enlightened legislation, humane institutions, and that priceless heritage, the common law, are secured for our children.

Lose Kansas and what will be the result? Not only will the curse of slavery fasten like a cancer upon that beautiful Territory—spreading desolation physical and moral in its extending course, but the vast emigration from abroad that is now poured into our midst and overflows westward, stopped suddenly by a line of slave States, will fall back upon our free States, giving us a surplus population that we do not want and which will necessarily interfere with the employment and the wages of our own citizens. This is a practical view of the case which every farmer, every mechanic, and every laborer in the free States should carefully consider.

Compare again the relative addition made to the commercial prosperity of the Atlantic States, and particularly of the city of New York, by Ohio and Kentucky, and then glancing forward to the future, if but for fifty or an hundred years hence, endeavor to estimate the superior benefits to accrue to the Atlantic States from these western Territories if organized as free States over those to accrue from their establish-

ment as slave communities. Think too of the difference it will make to your children and grandchildren if they wish to emigrate to those Territories whether they are to enter a State on an equal footing with the highest citizen or as one whose condition is regarded as inferior to that of the southern slave.

Of its hatred to free society the Democratic party at the South do not pretend to make a secret. "Free society," says the "Muscogee (Ala.) Herald," a Buchanan organ—"we sicken at the name. What is it but a conglomeration of greasy mechanics, filthy operatives, small-fisted farmers, and moon-struck theorists? All the northern and especially the New England States are devoid of society fitted for well-bred gentlemen. The prevailing class one meets with is that of mechanics struggling to be genteel and small farmers who do their own drudgery, and yet who are hardly fit for association with a southern gentleman's body servant."

Contrast, gentlemen, with that sentiment, now reiterated by the Buchanan organs at the South, the sentiment expressed by the leader of the Republican party: "Free labor—the natural capital which constitutes the real wealth of this great country and creates that intelligent power in the masses alone to be relied on as the bulwark of free institutions."

You have in these rival sentiments the gist of the issue now submitted to the American people. It is a struggle between slavery and freedom—between the small oligarchy of slave masters with its capital of \$2,000,000,000 invested in human flesh and the great body of free laborers who constitute the bulk of the nation for the possession of the unorganized Territories of the United States.

These Territories exceed in extent by some thirty-three thousand square miles all of the United States both free and slave States; and whose area is more than twice as large as

that of the free States now admitted to the Union. The slave States have already secured for slavery an area of 857,508 square miles, while the free States embrace only 612,596 square miles, and with this immense preponderance in their favor, with millions of acres yet unoccupied, they seek to defraud us of Kansas and Nebraska Territories, doubly ours by divine right and by human compact, and to force slavery into every part of the continent where the flag of our Union waves and federal authority has sway.

It is idle to talk of pacification or compromise; it is idle to speak of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise as a thing to be regretted but at the same time to be acquiesced in. That repeal has not yet made Kansas a slave State, and if we are true to ourselves it never will make Kansas a slave State. It was but the commencement, not the end of the battle. Its passage shows not that we have lost Kansas, but only that slaveholders have lost their honor. It shows that henceforth against the slave power which mocks at faith and tramples on compacts, which glories in the brutality that struck down a defenceless senator and insulted at one blow the sovereignty of Massachusetts, and the right of the people and which now holds Kansas by the throat—that against this power our only safety is in the rescue of the government from its control, and its absolute restriction of slavery to the States where it now exists. With a foe that treaties cannot bind, and that glories alike in national perfidy and social treachery, eternal vigilance must be the price of liberty—vigilance to protect the people from the betrayal of their dearest rights; vigilance to shield their representatives in Congress in unsuspecting moments from the stealthy blow of the assassin. . . .

Of Cuba, the design to annex it is intimated in the last resolution of the Cincinnati platform, where it is declared

that "the Democratic party will expect of the next administration, that every proper effort be made to ensure our ascendancy in the Gulf of Mexico." And Mr. Keitt recently declared in public that Cuba would be taken and that "the Democratic party would take it."

"The proper efforts" to this end, which are expected of Mr. Buchanan, should he be elected to the presidency, were disclosed by him in advance in the Ostend manifesto. A price is to be offered to Spain for Cuba far beyond its present value; when that has been refused, as it has been, and as in all probability it will be again, then the question is to be considered, "Does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our peace and the existence of our cherished Union?" "Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then, by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain if we have the power!"

This is the "proper method," approved by Mr. Keitt, and which in a certain contingency he proposes to apply not only to the gem of Spain, but to the treasury of the United States,—

— "the good old plan,  
That they shall take who have the power,  
And they shall keep who can."

It was to the credit of Mr. Marcy that this proposal was repudiated and its morality denied. But if Mr. Buchanan shall become the President of the Republic, and his piratical doctrines avowed at Ostend become, as Mr. Keitt expects, a leading principle of his administration, we may live to see our once gallant navy manned with lawless buccaneers, setting forth to seize Cuba—"if they have the power"—with the black flag of slavery and the death's head and cross-bones of the pirate flaunting defiance to the world, above the star-spangled banner of our country.

On the question of disunion, as on that of the Missouri Compromise, the fact that the candidate of the Democratic party is "no longer James Buchanan," is evident when we recall his former sentiments on the subject and compare them with that of the platform which he has now adopted as "his guide, philosopher, and friend." "Disunion," said Mr. James Buchanan, "is a word which ought not to be breathed even in a whisper. The word ought to be considered one of direful omen, and our children taught that it is sacrilege to pronounce it."

Mr. A. G. Brown, one of the committee who announced the Cincinnati nomination to Mr. Buchanan, in anticipating the possible success of the Republican party, said in a recent speech :

"If indeed it has come to this that the Union is to be used for these accursed purposes, then, sir, by the God of my fathers, I am against the Union; and, so help me heaven, I will dedicate the remainder of my life to its dissolution."

Mr. Keitt frankly avows that he "has been a disunionist since he began to think."

The "Richmond Enquirer" declares, after enumerating the preparations of Virginia for war:

"Virginia makes no boast of these preparations, but, sure as the sun shines over her beautiful fields, she will treat the election of an Abolitionist candidate as a breach of the treaty of 1789 and a release of every sovereign State in the South from all part and lot in its stipulations."

The Southern Democracy are aware, in the language of the "Nashville Banner," that if the Republican party succeeds, they "can have no more fortunate wars—no more judicious purchases of territory—no more annexing of independent States on the southern border."

They are using every effort to secure Kansas and our other Territories; with Cuba, Nicaragua, and a part or the whole of Mexico, as also Southern California, with the view of forming an independent Southern Empire. The thought of disunion to some of them is an ever-present thought. The "South Carolinian" declares that "the success of Buchanan might stave off the dissolution of the Union for a time, but that the event is inevitable."

Another South Carolina paper exultingly declares that "the southern skies are looking bright, and all the auguries foretell southern union, southern independence, and the coming greatness of a southern republic."

"Disunion," a word that Mr. Buchanan would not have spoken in a whisper, the candidate of the Democratic party hears shouted exultingly in crowds; and he has added fuel to the treasonable flames that his partisans are kindling in the South, by unjustly intimating that the people of the North are "intermeddling" with the domestic concerns of the South when they resist pro-slavery aggression upon rights secured to them by compact. . . .

The platform of the American (sometimes called the Know-Nothing) party practically ignores the one great issue now agitating the country; and, as regards the rights of Kansas on the one hand and the schemes for pro-slavery extension on the other, preserves so significant a silence and so positive a neutrality that those entertaining the most opposite opinions on these points are expected to meet in harmony and elect a President upon the ground of proposed reforms in the naturalization of aliens, with neither pledges nor principles on the one question of the day. The Northern members of the national convention at which the platform was adopted, offered a resolution to the effect "that we will

nominate no candidate for President or vice-president who is not in favor of interdicting the introduction of slavery north of 36 degrees 30 minutes." The resolution was laid on the table by a vote of yeas 141 to nays 52; and Mr. Fillmore was nominated on this neutral platform, which offers no opposition whatsoever to the extension of slavery. Mr. Fillmore himself stands before the country a perfect cipher on the question of Kansas, whose wrongs have elicited from him neither sympathy nor rebuke. . . .

It is pleasant, gentlemen, to turn from these schemes for slavery extension to glance at the Republican party that has sprung into existence, like the armed Minerva, from the brain of Jove—beautiful in its proportions and terrible in its strength—with the principles of Washington and the Fathers for its chart, and "the pathfinder of empire" to bear aloft its standard.

The platform of the Republicans, as adopted at Philadelphia on the 18th of June, 1856, is at once so simple and comprehensive as to admit all Americans who are in favor of restoring the government to the principles of Washington, and putting a final stop to the extension of slavery, without compromising their individual preferences on the other political questions which naturally exist in our government, but which are, for the time, overshadowed by this paramount issue.

The Republican party holds that an adherence to the principles of the Fathers and the Declaration of Independence—which the sham democracy of the day ridicules as a tissue of glittering sounding generalities—is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions, of the federal constitution, of the rights of the people, and the union of the States. It denies the authority of Congress, or of any territorial

legislature, or of any association of individuals to establish slavery in the Territories, and claims that it is the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit in the Territories those twin relics of barbarism—slavery and polygamy. It arraigns the Pierce administration before the country and the world for the crimes it has instigated and perpetrated against Kansas. It declares that Kansas should be admitted as a free State, with its present free State constitution; and, having thus declared its policy at home, it denounces the highwayman's plea, that might makes right, as declared in the Ostend circular, as unworthy of American diplomacy.

Is there a single point in that platform to which you cannot heartily subscribe? Do you find there anything that conflicts with the rights of the South, with the duties of the North, or with the proper harmony of the Union? For myself, I believe that the triumph of these principles—making it a fixed fact for all coming time, that slavery shall not be extended beyond its present limits—can alone quiet the country and secure the stability and repose of the Republic. If the struggle is not now ended it will undoubtedly continue. The election of Buchanan and the triumph of slavery would be not a settlement but only a postponement of the question.

Such are the principles of the Republicans, which they have not invented in Cincinnati nor imported from Ostend, but which they find in the writings of the Fathers of the Republic, and in the constitution that they ordained for the establishment of liberty and justice. Such is the platform,—now for the candidate. . . .

The hour for a change has come and with the hour appears the man. The country demands a change not only of policy but of rulers.

We want no longer men who have made politics a trade—

who have grown gray in party traces—who in the pursuit of office have veered from federalism to democracy, from democracy to slavery and buccaneering, and who now merge principles and ideality in the Cincinnati platform,—nor do we want one who has plunged from abolitionism into slave-catching and from slave-catching by a natural transition, I cannot call it a descent, into sectionalism and disunionism—viewing the while with cold indifference the sacrifice of freedom and the wrongs of Kansas. Our people demand one whose heart beats responsive to their own—who unites the generous enthusiasm of youth with the matured vigor and wisdom of manhood.

They need one who has given a guarantee in the past for his career in the future—one whose identity and individuality is stamped upon his life—who fears not to avow in out-spoken words his manly principles and who would scorn to become the padlocked plank of a platform or the pliant puppet of a party.

The day approaches when you are to do your part toward determining the question of America free or America slave. One of the famous laws promulgated by Solon for the governance of the Athenians declared dishonored and disfranchised every citizen who in a civil sedition stood aloof and took part with neither side. Here, gentlemen, the very government is in rebellion against the constitution and the people and Kansas looks to you to free her from its tyrannic grasp. Remember the dignity of your position—ponder the importance of your vote. Upon the ballots cast in your quiet village may depend the future of the republic—the destiny of the continent.

The issue is the broad one of freedom and slavery. All other issues are for the time absorbed in this, and personal

animosities and prejudices should disappear before a common danger as in the early days of the republic. Shall our constitutional liberties be preserved? Shall the mission of the country be accomplished? Shall peace and freedom shower their blessings over our western Territories? or shall club-law rule at Washington? Shall honorable murderers stalk unpunished in the capital? Shall a military despotism trample the life-blood from our Territories, and an arrogant oligarchy of slave masters rule as with the plantation-whip twenty millions of American citizens?

That is the issue. It concerns not only the North, but the South, where an immense majority of non-slaveholders are now shorn of their rights by the exacting influence of slavery.

Ours is no sectional party. It is bounded by no geographic lines. We believe with Burke that virtue does not depend on climate or degrees. We fight not against a section but a class; not against a people but a system. Our leader is one whom the South has delighted to honor, and it should not be forgotten that to South Carolina that gave birth to a Brooks, whom the House of Representatives spurned as the assassin-like assailant of Charles Sumner—to the same South Carolina belongs the credit of having reared Fremont, whom by God's blessing we hope to install as the constitutional defender of the liberties of the country.

Our opponents would have us believe that instead of "Fremont and victory," we are on the verge of a defeat. Whether victory or defeat await us duty is ours, consequences are God's, and I have long regarded the battle for freedom in America as one that we are to wage steadfastly if not hopefully while life lasts, preserving untarnished the weapons of our fathers, and bequeathing them unrusted to

our sons. Stand by the principles of the Declaration of Independence, whose irresistible point and divine temper converted rebellion into revolution—contend as your fathers contended for “the rights of human nature.”

Nothing, it is said, can be more uncertain than the near future of American politics. Men's judgments in such cases are naturally biased by their wishes and influenced perhaps, more or less, by the predominancy of one party or another in their own neighborhood. The “New Orleans Delta,” reviewing from that far corner the whole country, declares that party leaders engaged with the loaves and fishes have culpably kept them in ignorance of the real strength of the Republican party, which it says threatens to swallow up every other in the North as the rod of Moses swallowed up those of the Egyptians. It admits that the Republican party has increased, is increasing, and is not likely to be diminished, a fact that, it remarks, has just spoken with 8,000 voices in Iowa, 15,000 in Vermont, and 20,000 in Maine with Blair, a Fremontier from a slave State, and that these, as signs of the times, possess the utmost significance. It reminds its readers that like causes produce like effects and it anticipates a similar result in all of the free States.

There are two disturbing causes that may prevent this result: one, the deception that has been practised by the Democratic leaders in some of the States in pretending to be opposed to the extension of slavery, and the belief which they have been successful in propagating, that the rights involved in the Missouri Compromise have been definitely disposed of by its repeal, whereas it is the very question in an intensified form that is now directly put by the people of Kansas to the people of the United States.

It is no longer shall slavery be permitted to pass the line

of 36 degrees 30 minutes quietly and under the sanction of "popular sovereignty?" but shall it be permitted to pass that line by the aid of fraudulent elections, a lawless executive, and a corrupt judiciary by the connivance of the federal government and the power of the federal arm, trampling upon the constitution of the United States, the sovereignty of Kansas, and the rights and liberties of its people?

The blood already spilt in consequence of the repeal of the Missouri compact drips from the hands of every man who aided that breach of faith. But he who now votes for either Buchanan, who indorses, or for Fillmore, who by his silence approves the encroachment of slavery upon Kansas, not only incurs, with the original repealer of the compact the ancient curse, "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark. And all the people shall say, amen," but he assumes the responsibility of all the blood that is destined to water the plains of Kansas if the slave power is now supported in its attempt to force slavery upon that consecrated soil.

The other disturbing cause is the power of money in the hands of men whose principles allow them to approve the election frauds perpetrated in Kansas, and who may be ready to repeat the experiment nearer home. With a certain class of politicians the importation of illegal votes and other frauds upon the purity of elections seem to be regarded as venial offences, if not actually entitling them to the gratitude of their party, when in truth no act of treason can strike more directly at the sovereignty of the people and the stability of the Republic.

Looking at our future prospects it is to be remembered that the people of the slave States also are awakening to a knowledge of their strength and a remembrance of their right and truest interest. Not only Missouri but Virginia too are pre-

paring to throw off the insolent domination of the slave power, and the manly spirit shown by Professor Hedrick of South Carolina, in avowing his principles and preference for Fremont, is an indication that the Reign of Terror which banishes booksellers, silences presses, and gags all expression of anti-slavery sentiment, will soon suffer interruption.

Tyranny and treachery though they may prosper for a while irresistibly sow the seeds of their own destruction, and if we are but true to ourselves, true to the principles of our fathers, true to the historic associations that cluster about our soil, let us trust that we shall soon restore freedom to Kansas and quiet to the Union, and let us resolve and re-resolve never to falter in our course until we have placed the federal government on the side of freedom and reinaugurated that olden policy of Washington and Jefferson by which they ordained that throughout the wide extent of our western Territories "the sun should not rise upon a master nor set upon a slave."

# HENRY W. DAVIS



HENRY WINTER DAVIS, an American politician, son of an Episcopal clergyman at Annapolis, Md., was born in the latter city, Aug. 16, 1817, and died at Baltimore, Md., Dec. 30, 1865. Educated at Kenyon College, he studied law at the University of Virginia, and began to practice his profession in Alexandria. In 1840, he removed to Baltimore, where he soon became prominent in social and professional circles. He entered Congress in 1855 as a Whig member, and on the dissolution of the Whig party joined the American or "Know-Nothing" party. In 1859, he voted for Pennington, the Republican candidate for speaker of the House; and when censured for this act by the Maryland legislature, announced to his constituents that "if they were not disposed to allow him to use his private judgment regarding the best interests of his State, they might send a slave to Congress if they chose, but they should not send him." After the attack upon the Massachusetts troops at Baltimore, in April, 1861, Davis declared himself an unconditional Union candidate for Congress. He was much abused for this announcement and defeated at the polls. He sat in Congress, nevertheless, from 1863 to 1865, and was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was an enthusiastic advocate of emancipation and favored the enlistment of negro soldiers in the Federal army. In 1865, he spoke at Chicago in favor of negro suffrage. Davis was a man of strong convictions, with considerable courage in their avowal, and as an orator was alike brilliant and forcible. His published works include "The War of Ormuzd and Ahriman in the Nineteenth Century" (1853), and a collection of "Speeches and Addresses," posthumously published.

## ON RECONSTRUCTION

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 22, 1864

M R. SPEAKER,—The bill which I am directed by the committee on the rebellious States to report is one which provides for the restoration of civil government in States whose governments have been overthrown. It prescribes such conditions as will secure not only civil government to the people of the rebellious States, but will also secure to the people of the United States permanent peace after the suppression of the rebellion. The bill challenges

the support of all who consider slavery the cause of the rebellion, and that in it the embers of rebellion will always smoulder; of those who think that freedom and permanent peace are inseparable and who are determined, so far as their constitutional authority will allow them, to secure these fruits by adequate legislation. The vote of gentlemen upon this measure will be regarded by the country with no ordinary interest. Their vote will be taken to express their opinion on the necessity of ending slavery with the rebellion and their willingness to assume the responsibility of adopting the legislative measures without which the result cannot be assured, and may wholly fail of accomplishment. . . .

What is the nature of this case with which we have to deal, the evil we must remedy, the danger we must avert? In other words, what is that monster of political wrong which is called secession? It is not, Mr. Speaker, domestic violence, within the meaning of that clause of the constitution, for the violence was the act of the people of those States through their governments, and was the offspring of their free and unforced will. It is not invasion, in the meaning of the constitution, for no State has been invaded against the will of the government of the State by any power except the United States marching to overthrow the usurpers of its territory.

It is therefore the act of the people of the States carrying with it all the consequences of such an act. And therefore it must be either a legal revolution, which makes them independent and makes of the United States a foreign country, or it is a usurpation against the authority of the United States, the erection of governments which do not recognize the constitution of the United States, which the constitution does not recognize, and therefore not republican governments of

the States in rebellion. The latter is the view which all parties take of it. I do not understand that any gentleman on the other side of the House says that any rebel government which does not recognize the constitution of the United States and which is not recognized by Congress is a State government within the meaning of the constitution. Still less can it be said that there is a State government, republican or un-republican, in the State of Tennessee, where there is no government of any kind, no civil authority, no organized form of administration except that represented by the flag of the United States, obeying the will and under the orders of the military officer in command.

It is the language of the President of the United States in every proclamation of Congress, in every law on the statute-book, of both Houses in their forms of proceeding, and of the courts of the United States in their administration of the law.

It is the result of every principle of law, of every suggestion of political philosophy, that there can be no republican government within the limits of the United States that does not recognize but does repudiate the constitution and which the President and the Congress of the United States do not, on their part, recognize.

Those that are here represented are the only governments existing within the limits of the United States. Those that are not here represented are not governments of the States, republican under the constitution. And if they be not then they are military usurpations, inaugurated as the permanent governments of the States, contrary to the supreme law of the land, arrayed in arms against the government of the United States; and it is the duty, the first and highest duty, of the government, to suppress and expel them. Congress must either expel or recognize and support them. If it do not

guarantee them it is bound to expel them; and they who are not ready to suppress are bound to recognize them.

We are now engaged in suppressing a military usurpation of the authority of the State governments. When that shall have been accomplished there will be no form of State authority in existence which Congress can recognize. Our success will be the overthrow of all semblance of government in the rebel States. The government of the United States is then in fact the only government existing in those States, and it is there charged to guarantee them republican governments.

What jurisdiction does the duty of guaranteeing a republican government confer under such circumstances upon Congress? What right does it give? What laws may it pass? What objects may it accomplish? What conditions may it insist upon and what judgment may it exercise in determining what it will do?

The duty of guaranteeing carries with it the right to pass all laws necessary and proper to guarantee. The duty of guaranteeing means the duty to accomplish the result. It means that the republican government shall exist. It means that every opposition to republican government shall be put down. It means that everything inconsistent with the permanent continuance of republican government shall be weeded out.

It places in the hands of Congress to say what is and what is not, with all the light of experience and all the lessons of the past, inconsistent, in its judgment, with the permanent continuance of republican government; and if in its judgment any form of policy is radically and inherently inconsistent with the permanent and enduring peace of the country, with the permanent supremacy of republican government,

and it have the manliness to say so, there is no power, judicial or executive, in the United States that can even question this judgment but the people; and they can do it only by sending other representatives here to undo our work.

The very language of the constitution and the necessary logic of the case involve that consequence. The denial of the right of secession means that all the territory of the United States shall remain under the jurisdiction of the constitution. If there can be no State government which does not recognize the constitution, and which the authorities of the United States do not recognize, then there are these alternatives, and these only: The rebel States must be governed by Congress till they submit and form a State government under the constitution; or Congress must recognize State governments which do not recognize either Congress or the constitution of the United States; or there must be an entire absence of all government in the rebel States—and that is anarchy.

To recognize a government which does not recognize the constitution is absurd, for a government is not a constitution; and the recognition of a State government means the acknowledgment of men as governors and legislators and judges, actually invested with power to make laws, to judge of crimes, to convict the citizens of other States, to demand the surrender of fugitives from justice, to arm and command the militia, to require the United States to repress all opposition to its authority, and to protect it against invasion—against our own armies; whose senators and representatives are entitled to seats in Congress, and whose electoral votes must be counted in the election of the President of a government which they disown and defy. To accept the alternative of anarchy as the constitutional condition of a State is to

assert the failure of the constitution and the end of republican government. Until therefore Congress recognizes a State government organized under its auspices there is no government in the rebel States except the authority of Congress. In the absence of all State government the duty is imposed on Congress to provide by law to keep the peace, to administer justice. . . .

When military opposition shall have been suppressed, not merely paralyzed, driven into a corner, pushed back, but gone, the horrid vision of civil war vanished from the South, then call upon the people to reorganize in their own way, subject to the conditions that we think essential to our permanent peace, and to prevent the revival hereafter of the rebellion—a republican government in the form that the people of the United States can agree to.

Now for that purpose there are three modes indicated. One is to remove the cause of the war by an alteration of the constitution of the United States, prohibiting slavery everywhere within its limits. That, sir, goes to the root of the matter and should consecrate the nation's triumph. But there are thirty-four States; three fourths of them would be twenty-six. I believe there are twenty-five States represented in this Congress; so that we on that basis cannot change the constitution. It is therefore a condition precedent in that view of the case that more States shall have governments organized within them. . . . But under any circumstances, even upon that basis, it will be difficult to find three fourths of the States, with New Jersey, or Kentucky, or Maryland, or Delaware, or other States that might be mentioned, opposed to it, under existing auspices, to adopt such a clause of the constitution after we shall have agreed to it. If adopted it still leaves all laws necessary to the ascertain-

ment of the will of the people, and all restrictions on the return to power of the leaders of the rebellion wholly unprovided for. The amendment of the constitution meets my hearty approval, but it is not a remedy for the evils we must deal with.

The next plan is that inaugurated by the President of the United States in the proclamation of the 8th December (1863), called the amnesty proclamation. That proposes no guardianship of the United States over the reorganization of the governments, no law to prescribe who shall vote, no civil functionaries to see that the law is faithfully executed, no supervising authority to control and judge of the election. But if in any manner by the toleration of martial law, lately proclaimed the fundamental law, under the dictation of any military authority, or under the prescription of a provost marshal, something in the form of a government shall be presented, represented to rest on the votes of one tenth of the population, the President will recognize that, provided it does not contravene the proclamation of freedom and the laws of Congress; and to secure that an oath is exacted.

There is no guaranty of law to watch over the organization of that government. It may be recognized by the military power and not recognized by the civil power, so that it would have a doubtful existence, half civil and half military, neither a temporary government by law of Congress nor a State government, something as unknown to the constitution as the rebel government that refuses to recognize it.

The only prescription is that it shall not contravene the provisions of the proclamation. Sir, if that proclamation be valid then we are relieved from all trouble on that score. But if that proclamation be not valid, then the oath to support it is without legal sanction, for the President can ask

no man to bind himself by an oath to support an unfounded proclamation or an unconstitutional law even for a moment, still less after it shall have been declared void by the supreme court of the United States.

It is the paramount right of every American citizen to judge for himself on his own responsibility of his constitutional rights, and an oath does not bind him to submit to that which is illegal. . . .

By the bill we propose to preclude the judicial question by the solution of a political question. How so? By the paramount power of Congress to reorganize governments in those States, to impose such conditions as it thinks necessary to secure the permanence of republican government, to refuse to recognize any governments there which do not prohibit slavery forever.

Ay, gentlemen, take the responsibility to say in the face of those who clamor for the speedy recognition of governments tolerating slavery, that the safety of the people of the United States is the supreme law; that their will is the supreme rule of law, and that we are authorized to pronounce their will on this subject. Take the responsibility to say that we will revise the judgments of our ancestors; that we have experience written in blood which they had not; that we find now what they darkly doubted, that slavery is really, radically inconsistent with the permanence of republican governments; and that being charged by the supreme law of the land on our conscience and judgment to guarantee, that is to continue, maintain and enforce, if it exist, to institute and restore, when overthrown, republican government throughout the broad limits of the Republic, we will weed out every element of their policy which we think incompatible with its permanence and endurance.

The purpose of the bill is to preclude the judicial question of the validity and effect of the President's proclamation by the decision of the political authority in reorganizing the State governments. It makes the rule of decision the provisions of the State constitution, which, when recognized by Congress, can be questioned in no court; and it adds to the authority of the proclamation the sanction of Congress. If gentlemen say that the constitution does not bear that construction, we will go before the people of the United States on that question, and by their judgment we will abide.

# JOHN B. GOUGH



JOHN BARTHOLOMEW GOUGH, an eloquent and powerful Anglo-American temperance lecturer and orator, was born at Sandgate, Kent, England, Aug. 22, 1817, and died at Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa., Feb. 18, 1886.

His youthful education was meagre, and in 1831, when thirteen years old, he came to the United States, where he learned the bookbinder's trade. After a time he lost his employment, grew dissipated, and was fast becoming a hopeless drunkard. In 1842, however, he was induced to take the temperance pledge at Worcester, Mass., and at once became a reformed man. He had great natural gifts as a speaker and now utilized them in the temperance cause, becoming the foremost advocate of temperance in the United States. In 1853, he made a lecturing tour of Great Britain, and returned there in 1857, remaining and lecturing for three years, and paying a third visit in 1878. In the latter part of his career he lectured upon other topics than temperance and met with equal success. Temperance reform was nevertheless the work to which he devoted his main energies, and in the work of reformation he relied wholly upon moral influence and the pledge of abstinence to obtain results. He was thoroughly, intensely earnest, and mingled humor and pathos in his speeches in a manner that always found favor with his audiences. His home for many years was at West Boylston, Mass., where, from the savings from his lectures and literary work, he had purchased a little estate. His published works include besides an "Autobiography" (1853), a collected volume of "Orations" (1854); "Temperance Lectures" (1879); "Temperance Dialogues," "Platform Echoes" (1885); and "Sunlight and Shadow; or, Gleanings from My Life-Work."

## TEMPERANCE ADDRESS

DELIVERED AT TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON, SEPTEMBER 17, 1860

I STAND before you, ladies and gentlemen, to-night, as a trophy of the temperance movement. I am the servant of this movement, and I will be, God helping me, to the day of my death. But I stand here also as a trophy of this temperance movement. Last November I had spoken in the City Hall of Glasgow to twenty-five hundred people. I was staying at the house of one of the merchant-princes of that city, and, when we came down-stairs his carriage was at the door, silver-mounted harness, coachman in livery, footman in plain clothes. You know it is seldom teetotal lecturers

ride in such style, and it is proper therefore that we should speak of it when it does happen for the good of the cause.

As we came down the gentleman said to me: "It is so drizzly and cold you had better get into the carriage and wait until the ladies come down." I think I never had so many persons to shake hands with me.

"God bless you, Mr. Gough!" said one; "you saved my father."

"God bless you!" said another; "you saved my brother."

Said a third, "God bless you! I owe everything I have in the world to you."

My hands absolutely ached as they grasped them one after another. Finally, a poor wretched creature came to the door of the carriage. I saw his bare shoulder and naked feet; his hair seemed grayer than mine. He came up and said:

"Will you shake hands with me?"

I put my hand into his hot, burning palm, and he said:

"Don't you know me?"

"Why," said I, "isn't your name Aiken?"

"Yes."

"Harry Aiken?"

"Yes."

"You worked with me in the bookbinder's shop of Andrew Hutchinson, in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1842, didn't you?"

"Yes."

"What is the matter with you?"

"I am desperately poor."

I said, "God pity you; you look like it!"

I gave him something and obtained the services of Mr. Marr, the secretary of the Scottish League to find out about him. He picks up rags and bones in the streets of Glasgow

and resides in a kennel in one of the foulest streets of that city. When the ladies came to the carriage and got in I said:

“Stop! don’t shut that door! Look there at that half-starved, ragged, miserable wretch, shivering in the cold and in the dim gaslight. Look at him!”

The ring of that audience was in my ears, my hands aching with the grasp of friendship from scores, my surroundings bright, my prospects pleasant, and I said:

“Ladies, look there! There am I but for the temperance movement! That man worked with me, roomed with me, slept with me, was a better workman than I, his prospects brighter than mine. A kind hand was laid on my shoulder in Worcester Street in 1842; it was the turning-point in my history. He went on. Seventeen years have passed and we meet again with a gulf as deep as hell between us.”

I am a trophy of this movement and I thank God for it.

When I was leaving England five weeks ago last Wednesday night, they gave me a farewell in Exeter Hall (and there are some in this audience who saw it); and the reformed drunkards who had signed the pledge at my meetings during the ninety-five lectures I had delivered in that hall subscribed the means to buy me a Bible. A Bible from reformed drunkards! It is one of the most precious gifts I have ever received. I have brought it here for you to look at. That is it. A Bible from reformed drunkards, presented to me by a judge of the court of sessions for Middlesex County! A Bible!

I had had a presentation of a Bible once before; and I told them when they gave it to me, that I would put the books together. A Bible! Thirty years ago nearly, when I left England for America, I had this. Here they are! As

much "glory gilds the sacred page" in this (the small one) as that. There has been more comfort derived from this than from the other. That was my mother's Bible. When I was a boy twelve years old, and went from England to the United States to seek my fortune, she put that in my hand. Here on the cover I read,

" JANE GILBERT, born August 10, 1776.

" JOHN GOUGH, his mother's gift on leaving England.

" JANE GOUGH."

My mother had nothing to give me but that. That book was lost for years and years and years; but at last it was found in a garret in Bristol by Rev. Dr. Choules and his daughter kindly sent it to me.

I look at this Bible and I find marks all through it. They are very old; the ink is very brown; but there are marks round such passages as these: "Where the poor and needy seek water and there is none, I the Lord will hear them; I the God of Jacob will answer them. I will open fountains of water in dry places." And again: "For thy redeemer is thy husband, the Holy One of Israel." Mark after mark; and I love to look at them. That was the comfort of my mother, whose whole life was spent in battling for bread. Yet she had faith and patience and courage and love to the last. Her only child except myself, a sister, is present in this house, and, by the mercy of God, has been recently brought to receive the redeemer of her mother as her Saviour and her king. I glory in this.

I speak of these things because I have endeavored as far as I have been able (I speak now of myself) to base the whole work of reform upon this book. The Bible first, and everything else in subservience to this. And in Great Britain I have sometimes been pretty severely taxed because they sus-

tain the drinking customs of society by the Bible. My great object (and you will allow me to speak personally just now) is to advocate a sure plan for the removal of the evil of drunkenness; and I believe that the plan we adopt, of personal abstinence, is the best.

“Believing that the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage is not only useless, but hurtful to the social, civil, and religious interests of the community, and that while it continues to be used as a beverage it will never be done away, we do therefore agree that we will not use it.”

That I consider to be the basis, the grand foundation, of our efforts—total abstinence from intoxicating beverages and a hatred and antagonism to drink wherever we find it, whether it is on the side-board of the wealthy merchant, on the table of the clergyman, or in the dram-shop. Wherever I see the drink used as a beverage I hold myself ready to battle it to the death.

Now in England we have objection brought against that principle from the Bible; and as my pastor has told you, and as you all know very well, I am not a learned man: I do not understand Hebrew or Greek. If you show me a Greek and a Hebrew word, they are both Greek to me; and if you get them mixed up I am sure I cannot separate them again. I respect learning in others, and I wish I had more of it myself; but I do not understand what you mean by “*tirosh*,” “*yain*,” or “*oinon*.” But unlearned men must have a position which they can hold against the learned, and I believe that the prudent position for a man to occupy is not to advocate a question any further than he understands it. A person once came to me in England and said to me:

“Ah! Mistar Gough—ah!—why don’t you give us a physiologico lecture?”

"I suppose you mean," said I, "a physiological lecture; and the reason why I don't is because I don't understand physiology."

If I should undertake to talk about the pathology of drunkenness, and the influence of drink on the brain, the stomach, and the blood, I might talk away very learnedly and not understand a word I was saying, and when I had got through, a gentleman who is a physiologist might upset me entirely with two or three hard words which I did not comprehend. He is wrong, and I am right; but he has got the sympathy of the people because I have attempted to argue a question I don't understand and have got beyond my depth.

I wish to say here that the clergymen of the Church of England are positively doing more for the temperance movement than dissenters, and the same is true of their wives. I was invited to church with a clergyman who is now the Bishop of Carlisle, and we had a discussion for about two hours. A titled lady was present, and she helped him. I was alone and had to bear the whole brunt of the battle on the scriptural argument.

"The Bible permits the use of wine," said he.

"Very well," said I; "suppose it does."

"The Bible sanctions the use of wine."

"Very well; suppose it does."

"Our Saviour made wine."

"I know he did."

"Why, we thought you were prepared to deny this."

"I do not deny it; I can read."

"Wine is spoken of in the Bible as a blessing."

I replied, "There are two kinds of wine spoken of in the Bible."

"Now, then, you are not a learned man, prove it."

“ Well,” I said, “ I know there is.”

“ Prove it.”

“ I know there are two kinds of wine spoken of in the Bible.”

“ Prove it.”

“ I do not know that I can, but I will tell you what it is: The wine that is spoken of as a blessing is not the same wine that is called a mocker; and the wine that is to be drunk in the kingdom of Heaven cannot be the wine of the wrath of God; so that although I cannot prove it learnedly I know it is so.”

Now, there are others who go farther than I go; but you will please let me go just as far as I can understand it, and if I cannot go any farther don’t find fault with me. I hold that the Bible permits total abstinence, and I would rather search the Bible for permission to give up a lawful gratification for the sake of my weaker-headed brother, who stumbles over my example into sin, than to see how far I can follow my own propensities without committing sin and bringing condemnation upon any one’s soul.

Another gentleman who came to me for a long talk said: “ I have a conscientious objection to teetotalism; and it is this: Our Saviour made wine at the marriage of Cana in Galilee.”

“ I know he did.”

“ He made it because they wanted it.”

“ So the Bible tells us.”

“ He made it of water.”

“ Yes.”

“ Well, he performed a miracle to make that wine.”

“ Yes.”

“ Then he honored and sanctified wine by performing a

miracle to make it. Therefore," said he, "I feel that if I should give up the use of wine I should be guilty of ingratitude and should be reproaching my Master."

"Sir," said I, "I can understand how you should feel so; but is there nothing else that you put by which our Saviour honored?"

"No, I do not know that there is."

"Do you eat barley bread?"

"No," and then he began to laugh.

"And why?"

"Because I don't like it."

"Very well, sir," I said; "our Saviour sanctified barley bread just as much as he ever did wine. He fed five thousand people with barley loaves manufactured by a miracle. You put away barley bread from the low motive of not liking it. I ask you to put away wine from the higher motive of bearing the infirmity of your weaker brother and so fulfilling the law of Christ."

I wish to say that that man signed a pledge three days afterward.

I only mention this that I may give you some idea of the manner in which we have to advocate the movement in Great Britain.

Then there is a class of persons there—and I believe there are some in this country—who say, "Ah! you teetotalers are putting temperance in the place of religion." What do you think Mr. Spurgeon said to his people? I refer to what he was reported to have said in the papers, and I believe it; for I have it from an eye-witness that he drank a whole bottle of champagne at a dinner and ridiculed teetotalism; and if he can ridicule temperance publicly we may speak of him in public.

He said, "drunkenness is the curse of Great Britain; but total abstinence, my friends, is not the cure for drunkenness!"

Why, there is not a booby in the kingdom who does not know better than that. Now, I advocate teetotalism as a cure for drunkenness: I do not advocate it as a cure for anything else. A man may be a teetotal thief, a teetotal liar, a teetotal slanderer (and we have proved that, I think, within the past three years, pretty effectually); he may be a tee-total sabbath-breaker or a teetotal infidel, but he cannot be a teetotaler and a drunkard; can he? The principle I advocate cures drunkards; it cures nothing else, and we say it is folly for a man to tell us that we are putting temperance in the place of the gospel and undertaking to do that through its instrumentality which can only be accomplished by the grace of God. As the blood in my arm circulates upward, contrary to the law of nature, by the power of life that is in me; so the grace of God, operating upon a man's heart, changes the whole nature of the man. Teetotalism does no such work as that. We look upon teetotalism as one of the greatest agents to remove one of the most terrible hindrances to the hearing of the gospel; and if we look into Great Britain we shall see it. What is the great hindrance there to men's hearing the gospel? Drunkenness stood more in the way than any other agency; and, if I advocate teetotalism, I advocate it as an agency to remove one evil and only indirectly to do other work. To give you an illustration:

I spoke in Dundee to the outcasts of that town. The Right Honorable Lord Kinnaird and his lady were instrumental in getting up that meeting. It was such a meeting, I suppose, as you cannot see in this country; at least I never saw such a one. If such an audience can be gathered to-

gether here, I should like to see it and to address it. The town missionaries had got together a large mass of men and women, and you would have looked almost in vain to find one lingering trace of human beauty left. It seemed as if the foul hoof of debauchery had dashed it out. It was a horrid sight to look at,—rags, filth, nakedness,—a festering, steaming mass of putrefying humanity.

A woman sat at my feet, and the place was so crowded that I touched her. Her nickname for years had been “Hell-Fire.” The boys called her “Fire,” and she was known by no other name in the vicinity of her wretched residence. Fifty-three times she had been convicted and sentenced for from six days’ to four months’ imprisonment.

The ex-provost of the town (George Rough) said to me: “I never sent one policeman to take her; she was never mastered by one man. She is a muscular woman, and she will hit right and left. She has been dragged before me, time after time, with the blood streaming from her face.”

The Rev. Mr. Hannay and Mr. Rough said to me:

“If she kicks up a row, as she probably will, you will see one of the most comical rows you ever beheld. It is dreadful; but there is a comicality about it; she has such power with her tongue that it is amazing. We have seen men who could stand any amount of common swearing run when ‘Fire’ began to blaspheme.”

She sat there at my feet, and as I went on she interrupted me a little. I told that audience what they had been, what they might be, and what God meant they should be. I showed them that they were thwarting God’s good designs toward every one of them. I asked that mother if she did not remember sending that half-starved little child for a pennyworth of oatmeal and four pennyworth of whiskey. I

asked that young man to remember what he promised when he married that girl; and to go and look at that bed of rags to which he had brought her. Some of them lifted up their naked arms and said, "Oh! that is all true."

By and by the woman at my feet looked up and said, "Where did you learn all that?" Then she looked as if she had some important communication to make to the people, and she said, "Thet man kens a' about it. Would you give the likes o' me the pledge?"

"To be sure I will," said I.

"Oh, no, no!" said some; "it won't do for her to take the pledge."

I said, "Why not?"

"She can't keep it."

"How do you know?"

"She 'll be drunk before she goes to bed to-night."

"How do you know?"

"Madam," I said to her, "here is a gentleman who says you cannot keep the pledge if you sign it."

The woman flew into a rage. Said I, "Before you fight about it, tell me, can you keep it?"

The reply was, "If I say I will, I can."

I said, "Then you say you will?"

"I will."

"Give me your hand."

"I will."

"Then," said I, "put down your name."

After she had done it I said, "Give me your hand again."

She did so and said, "I will keep it."

"I know you will," I said, "and I shall come back again to see you."

"Come back when you will," said she, "and you will find I have kept it."

Some three years after, I went back. Lord Kinnaird presided over the meeting. The woman was there. After the meeting I introduced her to Lord Kinnaird, not as "Fire," but as Mrs. Archer, a very respectable Scotchwoman. She had on her white cap, and her cloak pinned across her breast. He shook hands with her. I went to her house. I wish I could tell you what she told me; I wish I could make you feel as she made me feel. She said, "I am a puir body; I dinna ken much; and what little I did ken has been knocked out o' me by the staves of the policemen; they pounded me o'er the head, sir. I dinna ken how to pray—I never went to God's house these twenty-eight years—I canna pray—but sometimes I dream" (and then her eyes filled). "I dream I am drunk, and I canna pray; but I get out of my bed, sir, and I kneel by the side of it, and I never get back to it until day-dawn; and all I can say is, 'God keep me!' I canna get drunk any more."

Her daughter said, "Ay, mon; and I have heard my mother, at the dead of night, on the bare floor, in the bitter winter-time, cry out, 'God keep me!' and I said, 'Mother, go to your bed;' and she said, 'No, no; I had a dream, and I cannot go and drink any more.'" That woman is now to be seen going every Sabbath to hear God's word preached,—she who had not entered God's house for twenty-eight years!

Teetotalism is not religion; but I thank God it has removed a hindrance to many a man and woman hearing that truth which must be believed, and must be heard before it is believed.

They are doing a grand work in England. Mrs. Bailey, the authoress of "Ragged Homes, and How to Mend Them," and Mrs. Wightman, authoress of "Haste to the Rescue," are noble women. Mrs. Bailey found poor wretched

creatures in such a state of degradation that she went to work among the women first, teaching them how to make their homes more happy; but their cry was, "We can do nothing while our husbands drink." What did she do? Setting an example to the women of Boston, she invited sixteen of the worst of the men (and bad enough they were; for they used to go out into the fields near the Kensington potteries and pummel each other to a jelly for a pot of ale; their fists were used to beat out God's image),—she invited, I say, sixteen of the worst of them to come to tea. Very much embarrassed were they after tea.

"I suppose," she said, "you hardly think any one has been caring for you for a great many years past?"

"Oh, yes!" they said, "we know well the policemen have been caring for us."

She told them she had been caring for them. She began, and at last she had seventy-eight of these men teetotalers; seventy-eight of them signed the pledge. She works with religion as well as with temperance. She instituted evening readings; and I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that to see seventy or eighty men who are covered with scars that have been received in Satan's service, with fists that have been used for fighting folded in their laps, sitting there, great men, and hearing that little woman reading—what?—"A new commandment give I unto you, that you love one another even as I have loved you;" and then to see the eyes grow dim, and the great hard hand brush away the tear, and hear the great heaving sob that shakes the strong man from head to foot as he hears for the first time these strange, sweet words,—I tell you that is a sight to stir the very soul. I say, sir, and I appeal to these ministers of the gospel, that if there is a movement based on a lawful principle that will bring men

from the deep, dark depths of drunkenness, only to hear such words as these, it demands your sympathy and the sympathy of every Christian minister and man the wide world over.

I said, when I began, that I was a trophy of this movement, and therefore the principal part of my work has been (not ignoring other parts) in behalf of those who have suffered as I have suffered. You know there is a great deal said about the reckless victims of this foe being "brutes." No, they are not brutes. I have labored for eighteen years among them and I have never found a brute. I have had men swear at me; I have had a man dance around me as if possessed of a devil and spit his foam in my face; but I never found a man I would give up. It may take a long time to reach his manhood; but he is not a brute. I think it is Charles Dickens who says, "Away up a great many pair of stairs, in a very remote corner, easily passed by, there is a door, and on that door is written—'WOMAN;'" and so in the heart of the vilest outcast, away up a great many pair of stairs, in a very remote corner, easily passed by, there is a door on which is written "MAN." Here is our business,—to find that door. It may take a long time; but begin and knock. Don't get tired; but remember God's long-suffering to us and keep knocking a long time if need be. Don't get weary if there is no answer; remember him whose locks were wet with the dew. Knock on; just try it; you try it; and just so sure as you do, just so sure, by and by, will the quivering lip and starting tear tell you you have been knocking at the heart of a man and not of a brute. It is because these poor wretches are men, and not brutes, that we have hopes of them.

I once picked up a man in the market-place. They said, "He is a brute; let him alone." I took him home with me

and kept the "brute" fourteen days and nights through his delirium, and he nearly frightened Mary out of her wits one night, chasing her all about the house with a boot in his hand. But she recovered her wits and he recovered his. He said to me, "You wouldn't think I had a wife and child?"

"Well, I shouldn't."

"I have; and—God bless her dear little heart!—my little Mary is as pretty a little thing as ever stepped," said the "brute."

I asked, "Where do they live?"

"They live two miles away from here."

"When did you see them last?"

"About two years ago."

Then he told me his sad story. I said, "You must go back again."

"I mustn't go back; I won't: my wife is better without me than with me. I will not go back any more. I have knocked her, and kicked her, and abused her; do you suppose I will go back again?"

I went to the house with him. I knocked at the door and his wife opened it.

"Is this Mrs. Richardson?"

"Yes, sir."

"Well, that is Mr. Richardson; and Mr. Richardson, that is Mrs. Richardson. Now come into the house."

They went in. The wife sat on one side of the room and the "brute" on the other. I waited to see who would speak first; and it was the woman. But before she spoke she fidgeted a good deal. She pulled up her apron until she got hold of the hem, and then she pulled it all down again. Then she folded it up closely and jerked it out through her fingers an inch at a time; and then she spread it all down

again; and then she looked all about the room and said, "Well, William!" and the "brute" said, "Well, Mary!" He had a large handkerchief around his neck; and she said, "You had better take the handkerchief off, William, you will need it when you go out." He began to fumble about it. The knot was large enough; he could have untied it if he liked; but he said, "Will you untie it, Mary?" And she worked away at it, but her fingers were clumsy and she couldn't get it off. Their eyes met, and the love-light was not all quenched: he opened his arms gently and she fell into them. If you could have seen those white arms clasped about his neck, and he sobbing on her breast, and the child looking in wonder first at one and then at the other, you would have said, "It is not a brute: it is a man, with a great big warm heart in his breast."

I tell you it is a glorious work to get at these hearts: it is a glorious work to play upon a man; to play upon him until you make him sing,—ay, and sing sweet music, too.

A man came to me at Covent Garden, summer before last, and said, "Mr. Gough, I want you to come into my place of business."

I replied, "I am in a little hurry now."

"You must come into my place of business!"

So, when he had got me there,—into a large fruit-stall, where he was doing business to the amount of two hundred and fifty or three hundred pounds (a thousand or twelve hundred and fifty dollars) a week,—he caught hold of my hand and said,

"God bless you, sir!"

"What for?—have I ever seen you before?"

"I heard you, sir," he said, "in Exeter Hall, in 1853. I was a brute!"

“No, you were not.”

“Well, I was worse.”

“No, you were not.”

“Well, I was as bad as ever I could be.”

Then he told me some sad things and went on:

“God bless you, sir! See what a business I am doing! Look here! See that woman in the corner: it is my wife. La! how I have knocked her about! Would you go and shake hands with her?”

“I have no objection.”

“Do, sir.”

“I went up to her and offered my hand. She held back and said, “My fingers are so sticky with fruit, sir!”

“La!” said the husband; “Mr. Gough, you don’t mind a little sticky fingers?”

“No, sir”—and I shook hands with her. Our fingers stuck together: they were more sticky than I had expected. Again the man said to me,

“God bless you, sir! I wish I could give you something. Do you like oranges?”

“Sometimes.”

He went to a shelf that was full of them and began to fill a bag with them. “That’s enough, sir;” but he paid no attention to me, but filled the bag and put it into my arms. “Go along with you!” said he; “don’t say a word; go along with you! God bless you!” I had positively to hire a cab to get home.

The day before Christmas I took an American lady—who is in this house to-night—to see this man, saying, “I am going to call on a gentleman whom I want you to see.” I had spoken on the preceding Monday evening in Exeter Hall for the eighty-first time; and you know when a man

speaks eighty-one times in one place on the same subject he gets pretty well pushed for matter: so I told this story there. The first thing he said when I entered his place of business was, "Oh! you gave somebody a terrible rub last Monday, didn't you?"

"You didn't mind it?"

"Mind it? No; I liked it. The man next to me kept a-nudging me and saying, 'That means you.' But, Mr. Gough, just look at that cellar!"

"I see the cellar."

"I want to show you this letter. I have a letter from Manchester ordering me to send them five hundred pounds of fruit. Now, do you suppose anybody would have ordered that of such a fellow as I used to be? Look at that cellar. I spent a whole Sunday in that cellar, on a heap of rotten vegetables, with a rope to hang myself by. I heard the bells chime for church, and knew when they were singing and when they were praying and when they were preaching. They little thought a poor wretch was down here fighting; for it was a steady fight all that day between that rope and me and my conscience. Now, sir, I lease that cellar and clear a hundred pounds a year. Here come my children—just from boarding-school—four of 'em. Shake hands with 'em. Oh, how I wish you lived where I do!"

Perhaps you are getting tired of these incidents; but there is one more of which I would like to speak to you, because it shows that we who work among the hardest and vilest outcasts are repaid by the fact that we are working for men. I was to speak in a certain place, and a poor fellow came with what is called a "fly,"—that is, a one-horse cab,—to take me some six miles to the railway station where I was to speak. I noticed that he was leaning forward, and then took

a handkerchief out of his pocket and tied it around his face. I said: "Have you a cold?"

"No."

Then he tied the handkerchief up this way.

"Have you the toothache?"

"No."

He seemed to lean forward and sit so uneasily that I said to him, "Why do you sit forward in that way?"

"Why, sir," he said, "the window of the carriage is broken, and I am trying to keep the wind off of you, sir."

"The Lord bless you, my friend! what do you mean by that? Are you putting your head in that hole to keep the wind from me?"

"Yes, sir, I a .."

"And why?"

He burst into tears: "It's because I owe everything I have in the world to you. When I first heard you I was singing ballads in the streets with my half-starved wife following me with a baby in her arms. Now I have a comfortable home. God bless you, sir! I'd stick my head in any hole under heaven for you."

The next morning I breakfasted with him at six o'clock. I have breakfasted and dined where they have had footmen,—with a great preponderance of calf, and top-knots, or whatever they call them, on their shoulders,—snatching your plate away before you got half through; but I have never had such a breakfast as that in my life. I believe that man and his wife had been up all night to get it ready for me. There was no floor except an earthen floor; the ceiling was of great rafters, blackened with smoke; but such a breakfast!

These are the men we are working for; and we defend the principle of total abstinence as a lawful principle in the

highest sense of the term; as an expedient principle; as a benevolent principle calculated to do this one work of rescuing the drunkard.

And another thing you will allow me to say, though certainly I did not intend or expect to make a long speech. I came laboring under this heavy affliction which has been referred to and I felt that it would be almost impossible for me to face an audience to-night; and therefore you must bear with me under the circumstances if I speak chiefly of these reminiscences of the past. I love this temperance movement. I ought to love it, and in that day for which all other days were made it will be seen that my love for the temperance movement has been next to my love for the blessed religion of the Lord Jesus Christ nearest to my heart. Do you suppose I can look at a scene like this and not recur to the past?

The past is ever before me; the past is to me one perpetual photograph that will never fade out; that grows more and more distinct the longer I live. The fire that scorched me in the distance seems to burn brighter, the iron that entered my flesh seems to be sharper the further I remove from it. For the love I bear the temperance movement I take no credit to myself. The temperance movement has made me what I am, if I am anything, if I am worth anything in this world; and for the temperance movement I mean to work to the day of my death. And I pray you that when I die I may die in the harness. I come back to you here. I see your young men plunged in dissipation. Oh, it is pitiful to go through the streets as I have in Boston to-day and see boldly and openly displayed the signs that tell us of the dreadful, horrible traffic that is carried on in spite of the will of the people. Who are these few men that dare to ignore the expressed will of the people? Who are they that dare to fill the lower

parts of your city with the horrible stench of the accursed distillery? Who are they that dare do this when the people say they shall not? Up, up, up, men of Boston! Crush it out! You can do it! Can? Some people say it is impossible. A great many begin and end all their effort by saying it is impossible. Do you remember the incident that occurred when Mr. Webster delivered his great oration at the foot of Bunker Hill monument? The crowd was pressing up on all sides toward the platform, and the committee said "Gentlemen, stand back." "We can't," said the crowd, and they never attempted it. They continued to press up. The platform began to crack, endangering life and limb.

"Stand back."

"We can't stand back," said the people and made no effort.

Mr. Webster rose to his feet and said, "Gentlemen, you must stand back."

"Mr. Webster, it is impossible to stand back." "Impossible?" said Webster; "On Bunker Hill nothing is impossible," and down the hill they went. They felt they could and they did. Impossible! It is not our business to create results; we cannot create results, but it is our business to work for results; and the highest position a man can occupy in this world is to stand as a machine, connected with his Maker by a band of loving faith,—God the motor-power, and man the machine. That is your business,—working where he will, when he will, as he will. No matter if you don't see a dramshop closed; that is not your business; work as if the next blow was to dash to pieces the Moloch of drunkenness; and if no results are visible till you lie down to die, die in faith that others are coming up to gather a full harvest on the field that you have planted and tended and prayed over, but have not been able to reap. It is ours to work.

# RAMON DE CAMPOAMOR



AMON DE CAMPOAMOR Y CAMPOOSORIO, Spanish poet, philosopher, and statesman, was born at Navia, province of Asturias, Sept. 24, 1817. Drawn early to literature, he also engaged in political life, in the former field being the earliest Spanish writer of his century to free himself from the spirit of romanticism; in the latter becoming a conservative, with strong royalist sympathies. In the régime of Queen Isabella he was successively Governor of Alicante and Valencia, and while a member of the Cortes he engaged in a lengthy controversy with the statesman, Emilio Castelar, in "El Estudio," his articles being subsequently reissued in a volume as "Polémicas con la Democracia" (1862). During the reign of Amadeo (1870-73) he held the position of director-general, and under Alfonso XII was counsellor of state. Campoamor is the constructor of a new species of composition frequently imitated by the younger school of Spanish writers, consisting of brief, humorous, sentimental poems with a touch of morality or philosophy, called "Doloras." His chief poetical writings include "Ternezas y Flores" (1840); "Ayes del Alma" (1842); "Fabulas Morales y Politicas" (1842); "Colon" (1853); "El Drama Universal" (1873); "El Amor y el Rio Piedra" (1882); "El Trén Express" (1885). Among his dramas may be cited: "Dies Iræ" (1873); "Cuerdos y Locos" (1887); "El Honor" (1874). His chief philosophical writings include "Filosofía de las Leyes" (1846); "Lo Absoluto" (1865); and "El Idealismo" (1883). A collection of his verse, "Obras Escogidas," appeared in 1885. In political life he distinguished himself as an orator.

## SPEECH AGAINST THE PRESS LAW

"Fortune gives favors  
That are not written."

I SAY this because we formerly had some liberty of the press, but we had no law on the subject. We are now going to have a press law, but in exchange we shall have no liberty.

I have risen to speak against the enactment of the press law because this press law has no other object, and will have no other result, than to put the press outside of the law.

Law, gentlemen, is a compact that joins two parties in equal rights and equal duties. In this project for a press law

I see expressed the duties which he that commands imposes upon him that has to obey; but where are expressed the duties which he that has to obey has the right to impose upon him that commands? In this project for a press law I see the rights which authority reserves to itself; but where are the rights reserved to liberty? Since in this projected law I see no rights for liberty, it follows that what I said at the beginning is true, that is, that this projected press law has no other object, and will have no other result, than to put the press outside of the law. I am going to prove this assertion: at the same time I will answer the honorable Minister of Administration, who complained yesterday that the orators who opposed the press law all said that the law was bad but did not say why.

I, even though I injure the gentlemen's natural feelings of paternity, am going to say why the law is bad, and I am going to say it in the most temperate and accommodating speech that the gentleman may have heard in all the days of his life. At the same time I am going to reply to the intelligent and honorable Minister of State, who yesterday laid before us a synthetic elaboration to prove that the law was good; and I, proceeding by the opposite method, am going to prove by analysis—not arbitrary like the synthesis of the gentleman, but real and genuine—that the law is not good; thus I shall prove to the honorable Minister of State that the law is not good, and to the honorable Minister of Administration that the law is completely bad. To prove this we shall begin by laying down three or four or five propositions.

First proposition.—This law legalizes the arbitrary.

Second proposition.—This law represents the negation, the impossibility of exercising virtue.

Third proposition.—This law represents the inevitable bankruptcy of the press.

Fourth proposition.—This law represents the blockade of public opinion.

Fifth proposition.—This law represents a state of siege for human intelligence.

We have said that the first proposition was that this law legalizes the arbitrary.—Proof. All those acts that, since they may be sanctioned or legalized by the sanction of a tribunal, are left to the free volition of political authorities, essentially movable, essentially and almost from duty impassioned, are so many other arbitrary acts.

In this law there is left to the disposition and the volition of the governing authorities all the following extremes:

First.—The law begins by demanding an impossibility; it begins by demanding that a responsible editor shall pay 2,000 reales in direct taxation, and that moreover he must have paid it three years in anticipation; an exigency which, in truth, I do not even know what object it may have, notwithstanding the reasons given by the honorable Minister of State. I do not know wherefore comes this representation of an editor who does not have to be responsible, for that which is definitely responsible is the deposit.

Very well. I would like to have the honorable deputies tell me if a responsible editor who pays a direct tax of 2,000 reales is not an important personage, worthy of the most aristocratic distinction. I would like to have them tell me what object this new aristocracy may have unless the government is thinking of introducing some new reform and is proposing to establish a new category of senators in their own right. For I can assure you that immediately this law becomes a fact almost all the responsible editors may become senators,

while there will be many senators who may not become responsible editors.

Second extreme.—By article 13 of this law the government reserves to itself the faculty of admitting or not admitting the editor of a periodical according to the information which it may find it convenient to request; and I would like to know what object the government has in not constituting a tribunal for deciding upon the qualities of a responsible editor. The object which the government proposes I comprehend: it is the object of the government to admit an editor or not according as it may be found convenient, according to the information which it may request. But there is yet more. By this article the government reserves to itself the faculty of examining at any time and at any hour whether the editor continues to possess the qualities that give him the aptitude for the discharge of his duties. The newspapers of the Opposition may be well assured that with this article there will be a removal of editorial bones much more frequently than may be convenient to their tranquillity.

Third extreme.—By article 4 of this law the government retains the faculty of suspending the sale and distribution of any publication. First step in which the spiritual collides with the material. And it not only retains this faculty, but with the reservation of the right to select the accuser from among the fiscal promoters nominated by the ordinary method: when, among the fiscal promoters nominated by the ordinary method, there may not be one sufficiently ductile for denunciation at the pleasure of the government, the latter has the right of nominating a special fiscal at any time and without any restriction, even though he be a fiscal who knows not Latin. . . .

Fifth extreme.—By article 5 of this law the government

reserves to itself the right of prohibiting the introduction into Spanish territory of all publications made abroad. I would like to be told what proof of intellectual eminence it is sufficient for the governing powers of Spain to give in return for the extraordinary faculty of exercising not only the particular monopoly of cutting down in its flower all indigenous intelligence, but also the universal monopoly of cutting down in its flower all exotic intelligence.

Sixth extreme.—In addition to all these reservations the government retains the right to dictate the regulations that it may find convenient for the police in regard to the sale and distribution of publications. According to the spirit of the law the Opposition newspapers must already know what facilities they will have for the sale and circulation of their editions. All these acts, when the greater part may be legitimatized by the sanction of a tribunal left to the free volition of the political authorities, essentially movable, essentially and almost by duty impassioned, constitute the most absolute legalization of the most absolutely arbitrary. Leaving out of consideration, gentlemen, that the arbitrary is a two-edged sword, and that if to-day we may wound our enemies at will without motive and without necessity, to-morrow our enemies, without necessity and without motive, will be able to assassinate us at will. Let the honorable Minister of Administration not deceive himself! All these faculties placed at the discretion of the governing authorities are no more than bread of government for to-day and hunger of justice for to-morrow.

Second proposition.—This law represents the negation, the impossibility, of exercising virtue.—Proof. It is twenty years since I have been writing for the public, and I have not learned—and I say it frankly—I have not learned what may not be committed by means of the press,—whether the more

sins against God, against the king, and, as they used to say, against the mistress of our thoughts; or in other words, against religion, against the monarchy, and against good customs. The honorable Minister of Administration, who is known to be very well versed in the subject, has presented to us an interminable list of offences, and he has made me see that I have been in the greatest error, and that whether these offences are offences or are not offences, virtue by means of the press is a negation. Outside of those that are marked by ordinary laws, those that are comprehended in the following categories are indictable offences when committed by the press:

First. Everything that censures religion or any of its ministers. (Question.—Even though its ministers are of the sort that do not exercise religion with the decorum that we are all obliged to respect?)

Second. All that censures or attacks any prince whatever. (Question.—Even though that prince meddles with politics and in a controversy commits an offence against us or offends the decorum of our country?)

Third. All that tends to restrict the liberty of the authorities. (And I ask: Even though these authorities tend to restrict our own liberty?)

Fourth. All that which tends to restrict the free exercise of constituted authority. (I would like to know if this is also to be understood as applying when the constituted authorities are lacking in the duties, lacking in the obligations, lacking in the necessities of that for which they were constituted?)

Fifth. All that which offends against good customs. (And what are often intended by good customs? Do not the editors of the law know that in many parts various activities

are regarded as good customs when in the eyes of reason and of morality they are evidently bad?)

Sixth. All that which publishes actions that offend the employees of the government. (Even though these actions are committed by very blameworthy employees and which belong to the domain of the public? In this law we find that everything is an offence, absolutely everything; only one thing is not an offence, which, with due respect to the moral intention of the authors of the law, appears to me abominable. This thing is the transgression authorized by the second paragraph of article 52, and the injury and the calumny directly authorized by the third paragraph against foreign monarchs who may be at war with Spain.)

And at the same time that this transgression and this calumny is not an offence, it is an offence, according to article 29, to suppose wrong intentions in official acts; to suppose wrong intentions, which is the positive duty of all oppositions in the world; to suppose wrong intentions in acts, in official acts, to the end that the governing powers prove by means of their official acts that their intentions are good.

Also a delinquent under this law is even the unfortunate one who, that he may not go to prison, appeals for a subscription to pay the expenses, the damages, and the costs of the case. I would like to know what the law proposes by the prohibition of this subscription, charitable or not charitable, Is it proposed to prevent public opinion from taking sides with the delinquent and giving an indirect vote of censure against the government?

If this is so, what are we doing here? Are we going to govern with public sentiment or against public sentiment?

In this law so little account is taken of the privileges of the press that under article 62 every newspaper, even though

acquitted, is not permitted to publish the defence of the denounced article. That is to say that to-day, the same as twenty or thirty years ago, the level of political liberty is below the level of civil liberty. By this means anybody in authority will be able to trample in advance upon the individuals in opposition; and these, even though their article may be absolved, will not by any means whatever be able to appeal to the recourse of publication in order to obtain a moral reparation. It appears that this law has the melancholy presentiment of making its penalties an honor to the delinquents. And is it not true that a law where the obligations are converted into crimes, and duties translate themselves into acts of insubordination, is it not true, I say, that it makes totally impossible the exercise of virtue? Is it not true that in this law there are no rights except for authority, there are no duties except for liberty? Is it not true that this law might be summed up in one single article that could read: "Newspapers are authorized to write freely under penalty of death?" Is it not true that this law runs contrary in a radical manner, in an absolute manner, against all the tendencies, all the aspirations, of our epoch of publicity? From publicity, gentlemen, more than from any other origin, will always be derived the palladium of liberty, will always be derived the sword of justice, will always be derived the torch of virtue and of morals, and it was publicity—and my friend, Señor Canga Argüelles, representative of other ideas, will pardon me—that put an end to those epochs of secrecy that lay at the foundation of all tyranny, that were the safeguard of all concussions; that were the occasion, the fundamental cause—and if it were not for arousing the hilarity of the Congress, I would say that secrecy was the phosphoritic producer of all vices.

Third proposition.—This law represents the inevitable bankruptcy of the press.—Let us suppose that an individual from a royal family invades the province of the press, becomes a public writer, publishes a given manifesto, and that some controversonist says that that individual of the royal family has published a manifesto unworthy of himself, or perhaps that that manifesto is unworthy an individual of the royal family. The newspaper is denounced; the judge-instructor institutes the preliminary proceedings. Under article 38 the honorable justices of the jury abandon their jurisdictions, leave public justice orphaned, and go to the capital to constitute themselves a tribunal. This done, under the provision of article 25, which says “that it is a delinquency on the part of the press to attack or offend any individual of the royal family,” there is nothing left but to condemn the newspaper. Hence proceed the following injuries: The newspaper has left off circulating; the subscribers have left off subscribing; the enterprise has suffered the losses inherent to a denunciation, and in the end has had to pay a respectable sum. This is an unhappy bankruptcy.

But let us suppose a happy bankruptcy, that of an absolution, and it will be seen that it is nevertheless an inevitable bankruptcy. A correspondent of some periodical or other writes, for example, that Señor Olózoga is a notable man. There is some fiscal of the press who takes upon himself the duty of seeing that Señor Olózoga is not to be called a notable man, but a notable statesman. Perhaps Señor Nocedal will say that these are hyperbolical exaggerations of Señor Campoamor, and that it is not possible that there would be a fiscal who would so occupy himself. But this, unbelievable as it is for many, is something that actually happened. Only a little time ago the correspondent of a newspaper wrote

saying that Señor Olózoga was a notable man, and on seeing him thus characterized the fiscal of the press sent an officer of the police to see that this expression was varied as commanded, substituting that of notable statesman. And lest the honorable minister might doubt the truth of this assertion, I have here the proof written in red ink, in commemoration doubtless of that celebrated prescription of Sila. Let us suppose that the correspondent is a writer who becomes exasperated, like myself, at unjust contradictions, and that he insists upon notable man instead of notable statesman.

New denunciation, new abandonment of their judicial limitations on the part of the honorable judges. They constitute themselves a tribunal, and I do them the favor of believing that they acquit the newspaper. Now it can be said that Señor Olózoga is a notable man. Here the result has been the following injuries: The newspaper has left off circulating; the subscribers have left off subscribing; the expenses inherent in a judicial procedure have been incurred; it is true that acquittal has come; but, acquittal or no acquittal, it will be a felicitous bankruptcy; nevertheless it will be bankruptcy, and, felicitous or unfortunate, the bankruptcy, as I have said, will it be the less inevitable?

All these things were well to laugh at were it not that in the course of time, as I believe, they will cause us many tears.

Very soon, with this law edited in this manner, there may be brought about at will the most inevitable bankruptcy of the press. This law, more than a serious law, appears to have been made to sport with the destinies of the country's liberty. This law seems like an iron cage made for the imprisonment of all the tendencies, all the aspirations, all the

grandeurs of the nineteenth century; and I say grandeurs of the nineteenth century with all intention to avail myself of the opportunity of expressing my astonishment that the honorable Marqués de Pidal, when I believed that he would reply to the representatives of certain doctrines in which this century constantly meets the most bitter diatribes —when I believed that he would have felt that the decorum of a society represented in the government was outraged—rather paid certain respect to those bitter diatribes and to the partisans of those doctrines that have gone by forever. Therefore I say the grandeurs of the nineteenth century, which will be the honor of history, which for posterity will be the pride of humankind. Of the nineteenth century, so great in morality that to-day the least of our convicts would be ashamed to have imputed to him some of the qualities of the virtuous Cato. Of the nineteenth century, so grandly illustrious that to-day the humblest of our lackeys would disdain to have his ignorance compared with the ignorance of those princes of letters who not long ago actually framed a case against somebody for flying and other excesses. Of the nineteenth century, which, should time need more immortality than the immortality of its being, might add to the immortality of time the immortality of glory!

Fourth proposition.—This law is the blockade of public opinion.—Proof. Suppose the case of the election of a president for this Congress! The election finds two contesting candidates, one very tolerant with the minority and hence more agreeable to public opinion; the other much less tolerant, and therefore more agreeable to the government of her Majesty.

The government seeks to procure the election of the less tolerant candidate, and consequently has to defeat the candi-

date of public opinion. To effect this, what does the government of her Majesty do? A very easy thing. Declare public opinion in a state of blockade. And how can public opinion be put in a state of blockade? By one of two modes at the disposition of the government. Exaggerate certain or supposed good qualities of its candidate, and impede public opinion from doing the same with its candidate! Permit to be sent to the place of residence of one candidate all the good things that may be deemed desirable; and at the same time sequester, under the authority given by article 4, all the newspapers that bear eulogies of the candidate of public opinion! But the honorable deputies will tell me: "The newspapers that publish the good qualities of the candidates of public opinion have the recourse of resort to the tribunals." Consequently they resort to the tribunals promptly and speedily: by the diligence of the judge-instructor all very promptly, with the promptness with which we must suppose a functionary would work who knows that he is going to do a thing unpleasant to the government of her Majesty.

Promptly and speedily, also, new journeys of the honorable judges who abandon their jurisdictional limits and assemble to constitute a tribunal, and I will suppose that they also promptly give their verdict for the press. Now the eulogies of the candidate of public opinion may be published. But, *O dolor!* the opportunity has passed; the election has taken place, and the government candidate has been victorious, and the candidate of public opinion has perished for want of help, not having received as much as one loaf from the munition of praise. Is it not true, gentlemen, that it may be said that this law is the perfect blockade of public opinion? Is it not true that this law is a half law, which has

inscribed upon one page the obligations, and yet to be written upon the other the guarantees?

Or, better said, is not this law like a half-minted coin bearing on the reverse the cross of duty and lacking on the obverse the face of right? Is it not true that this law proposes the solution of a problem completely insoluble; that it seeks to make possible the metaphysically impossible; that it seeks to prove that a thing may be and not be at the same time? Is it not true that this law contains the attempt to make of representative government, which is a government essentially open, which is a government essentially talkative, a species of constitutional deaf-mute?

Fifth proposition.—This law is the perfect state of siege of human intelligence.—Example. Let us suppose there is a newspaper written with such skill and justice that the government has no means of getting it out of the way; and since justice and skill are not always agreeable to the government it is necessary for the newspaper to disappear, and the newspaper will disappear. But how will it disappear?—the honorable deputies will ask me. Very easily; putting the newspaper in a state of siege. And how can a newspaper be put in a state of siege? With this law, by the following mode:

Every newspaper, however skilful and just it may be, has to have a responsible editor who some time will have to be ill, for health does not depend upon justice and upon skill. It may also happen that in consequence of this illness the editor cannot sign the newspaper, and hence the governor has nothing more to do than to institute a reconnaissance of the editorship by the police, and if the editor is found to be ill and has not been able to sign the newspaper with hand and letter, he can impose a fine of 1,000 reales upon the printer

of the newspaper, and following that familiar tale of one of the candle, of the candle two, the editor, for the same offence, is muled to the extent of 4,000 reales.

But let us suppose that this newspaper is published in Madrid. The mail closes at eight o'clock in the evening, and if the newspaper is to be well edited it cannot be printed until five or six and consequently must certainly be issued before the two hours are over within which a copy has to be taken to the governor of the province.

Consequence of this infraction: The governor imposes, by virtue of article 21, a fine of 4,000 reales, and since the offence is for every day we shall have a fine of 4,000 reales daily, which amounts to 120,000 reales a month, which is the same as 1,440,000 reales annually. All this without counting upon the power remaining with the governor of the province to impose a fine of 1,000 reales daily for the following:

First. When it appears to him there is a lack of decency.

Second. When according to his judgment, which may very well be lack of judgment, there is committed any offence against good customs without his being obliged to cite an example.

Third. Whenever he sees mischievous allusions, however veiled they may be,—and he will not fail to see them whenever he finds it convenient.

Fourth. Whenever the publication of a fact gives offence to families, such as the publication of a death, etc.

And now let the honorable deputies inform me if a newspaper, however just and skilful it may be, can afford to incur daily a fine of at least 1,000 reales.

It is true that against all these injustices of the governor of the province, nominated by the government, the press has

the right to appeal to the government that nominated the governor. Is it not true, gentlemen, that this law is the state of siege of human intelligence? Is it not true that this law is a two-edged sword, and that if to-day we may wound our enemies at free will without motive and without necessity, to-morrow our enemies, without necessity and without motive, will be able to assassinate us at free will?

Is it not true that all this integument of prescriptions in opposition to all political equity, that all this accumulation of arbitrary principles, are no more than bread of government for to-day and hunger of justice for to-morrow? Does it appear prudent to the honorable admirers of this blazing law; does it appear just; does it appear foresighted,—that to sustain our miserable governmental existence one day we leave this terrible weapon in the hands of future governments that may be our most implacable enemies; that we leave them this atrocious weapon which makes legitimate the arbitrary, which makes virtue impossible, which ruins the press, which blockades opinion, and which is the state of siege for human intelligence? Is it possible that the Moderate party—that party which by antonomasia is called the party of supreme intelligence—cannot be aware of the full terror, the full atrocity of that weapon until it may be seen in the hands of its implacable enemies? If this is the case, gentlemen, then the Moderate party may well be addressed by that well-known apostrophe:

“What fatal misfortune is that  
Of soliciting thine own harm?  
I lament, when thou wak'st in alarm  
It will cost thee thy life!”

I, the first of the Ministerialists; I, who am one of the most important members of the Moderate party, in which I was born politically, in which politically I shall die, who do not

belong to that caste of politicians of whom Clement XIV said "That they pass their lives in sinning and repenting;" I have some explanations to make, I have to give my reasons for washing my hands of this act that sacrifices the first of public liberties. I say sincerely that my face flushes and I feel myself involuntarily seized with a fever every time I hear our common enemies launch against us the accusation that the Liberal party is a party of a temperament so cowardly, of a rectitude so equivocal, and of an intelligence so exiguous, that it can only rule by means of a freedom of the press so restricted, intimidated, and well-nigh muzzled.

As I have had the honor to say on another occasion, I should like to issue a scientific challenge and a moral provocation against all the exaggerated schools to prove to them that the freedom of the press, in place of being their patrimony has always been the triumphant crown of conservative ideas. I should like to prove to our enemies that the Moderate party is a party with temperament so lofty, of rectitude so insuperable, and of intelligence so vast, that it has always been able, is able, and always will be able, to govern with a press, a liberty of the press, open, rationalistic, and even well-nigh unlimited.

Of all the militant political parties there is not one that has less to fear from the liberty of the press than the Moderate party. Depositary of almost the entire social force, of almost the entire public fortune, possessing the intellectual majority, the Moderate party cannot refuse discussion, cannot reject light. On the contrary the Moderate party superabounds in grand qualities of virtue, wisdom, intelligence, reason, justice, and right with which to battle with its enemies. Not in a closed passage and in darkness; no, it

can seek them out in an open thoroughfare, it can fight them hand to hand in the light of day, in the light of the sun, and if it were possible, in the light of all the stars of the firmament.

There appears to be a fatal law for all human institutions that they should love that which would slay them and fly from that which should give them life. The Moderate party clings to mutism, which means its death; and loves not the liberty of the press, which is that which would give it horizon, which is that which would lend it atmosphere, which is that which would inform it with vitality.

I have always believed, I do believe, and I shall continue to believe that for the Moderate party the liberty of the press will be what it has been until now, the true battle-steed with which we are to conquer all our enemies; those who attack us on the right flank as well as those who attack us on the left flank. I have always believed, do believe, and will continue to believe, that for the Moderate party the liberty of the press as until now it has always been the ship that has saved us from all despotic wreck, will in the future be for us the sacred ark that will rescue us from every communistic deluge. I have always believed, do believe, and shall continue to believe, that for the Moderate party the liberty of the press will be hereafter as it has been until now the true firm-standing wall against which in a way most fatal, in a way inevitable, there will vainly dash on the one hand all the surges of democracy, on the other hand all the avalanches of reaction.

Gentlemen, I am going to relate the coming history of this fatal law which is to have the sad privilege of slaying its own mother before its birth. When this law is published the safety-valve of representative government will be shut down:

all the lawful passions, all the legal tendencies, all the just aspirations will not be able to satisfy their legitimate desires for growth; these repressed lawful passions will be converted into concentrated hatreds; these concentrated hatreds are going to charge the political atmosphere with electricity; this electricity is going to accumulate in the atmosphere and is going to form a sullen tempest whose mutterings will arouse the rancor of our enemies; and for our friends it will make them pass a life filled with fear and tribulation, and then by the most unforeseen of happenings this invisible tempest, on a day least looked for, will fall upon our heads in the shape of a bloody revolution.

Whatever the consideration in which you hold the prophet, forget not the prophecy!

[Specially translated by Sylvester Baxter.]

# GEORGE S. BOUTWELL



GEORGE SEWALL BOUTWELL, American Senator and ex-Secretary of the Treasury, was born at Brookline, Mass., Jan. 28, 1818. His education was obtained at private schools and by prolonged private study. Entering law at Groton, in his native State, he was in 1836 admitted to the Bar, but did not begin practice till some years later. In 1840, he entered politics as a supporter of Van Buren, and served seven terms as a Democratic member of the State legislature of Massachusetts between the years 1842 and 1851. He was repeatedly defeated as a Congressional candidate, but in 1851 was elected Governor of Massachusetts by a coalition of the Democrats and Free-Soilers, after several previous defeats. On the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, in 1854, he took part in organizing the Republican party, and in 1860 was a member of the national convention that nominated Lincoln for the Presidency. By the latter he was appointed first commissioner, in 1862, of the department of internal revenue which he organized. From 1863 to 1869 he was a member from his State in Congress, and Secretary of the Treasury during President Grant's first administration, 1869-73, resigning in March of the latter year to fill the seat in the Senate vacated by Senator Henry Wilson, who had become Vice-president. After leaving the Senate, in 1877, he was appointed to codify and edit the Statutes at Large, and he subsequently practiced law in Washington for some years. His interest in politics has continued unabated since his retirement. He has published "Thoughts on Educational Topics" (1860); "A Manual of the Direct and Excise System of the United States" (1863); "The Taxpayer's Manual" (1865); "Speeches and Papers Relating to the Rebellion" (1876); "Why I am a Republican: a History of the Republican Party" (1884); "The Lawyer, the Statesman, the Soldier" (1887); "The Constitution of the United States at the End of the First Century" (1895). For many years he was a member, and at one time secretary, of the Massachusetts Board of Education.

## ON THE PROGRESS OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

ADDRESS BEFORE N. Y. HISTORICAL SOCIETY, APRIL 2, 1889

AT the close of the French war England entered systematically upon a policy whose object was the establishment of the supremacy of Parliament over the colonies of North America. For one hundred and thirty years this supremacy had been denied whenever the claim was presented. In that time manufactures and commerce,

although borne down by the weight of legislative restrictions, had so increased as to arrest the attention of the ministry and the board of trade, and excite the prejudices of the laborers upon the Thames and in the manufactories. The population of the thirteen colonies, then estimated at 2,500,000, had doubled by natural increase every twenty-five years, and it was then certain that it would be largely augmented by immigration from Europe.

This population was better fed and better clothed than the corresponding classes in England. The inhabitants of the colonies had acquired great experience in the Indian wars, the siege of Louisbourg, and the invasion of Canada. Their bravery was unquestioned. The future greatness of America had been predicted, its natural resources had in a degree been unfolded.

England was burdened with debt and she thought that America might be compelled to contribute to its payment. The first question was this: Has Parliament a right to legislate for America? An affirmative answer suggested a second; what shall be the character of the legislation? In regard to the first question it ought not to have been expected that "ex parte" opinions, whether accompanied by a show of power or not, would lead to an amicable adjustment of the controversy.

The only ground of hope was in negotiation and this appears not to have been thought of. England proceeded to legislate, and upon the question of policy she made a most fatal mistake. With sole reference to her own interests she would have exercised the power that she assumed in the least offensive way. She would have so legislated that in equity no issue could have been made with her acts. But on the contrary, guided apparently by an insensate lust of

power she passed laws which would have kindled rebellion if the right of Parliament had been undisputed. For the purpose of aiding the officers in the collection of the revenue an old and obsolete law was revived under which writs, called writs of assistance, were granted.

By these writs the agents of the government were empowered to search ships, shops, houses, and stores. They were in fact general search warrants. The first application was from the collector of the port of Salem, Massachusetts. The court hesitated. The merchants employed Thatcher and James Otis to resist the application. The writ was granted, but the speech of Otis so excited the people that John Adams fifty years afterward declared that "American independence was then and there born."

In the series of offensive laws first came the Stamp Act, then a declaration that Parliament had a right to legislate for the colonies in all cases whatsoever, then the acts for shutting up the port of Boston, then the act for altering the charter and government of Massachusetts Bay, an act for the better administration of justice, an act to establish the Roman Catholic religion in the Province of Quebec, an act for quartering the army upon the people and various acts for raising a revenue.

The Stamp Act was met by marked opposition in all the colonies, and in some of them the people adopted measures of injustice and violence.

It was determined on all hands that the stamps should not be landed and that no one should hold the office of agent. Those who accepted were compelled to resign. It was in vain that these officials claimed exemption from all responsibility for the existence of the statute, or that they set forth as an excuse that if they did not perform the service

other persons less acceptable would be appointed in their places. The people's ears were closed, there was no alternative but resignation.

In New York a gallows was erected in the park of the present City Hall and on it Governor Colden was hung in effigy; handbills were circulated warning those who sold or used stamped paper that their persons, houses, and effects were in peril, and the house of Major James, the commander of the king's artillery, was sacked by the mob and the colors of his regiment were carried away by the excited crowd.

Finally the stamp agent resigned and the stamps were delivered to the mayor and corporation of the city of New York, with the advice of his majesty's council unanimously given and the concurrence of the commander-in-chief of the king's forces.

In Boston the supporters of the ministry and of the Stamp Act were hung in effigy on a tree afterwards known as "Liberty tree," which stood at the corner of Essex and Washington streets. Oliver, the secretary of the Province and stamp distributor, was frightened into resignation. Jonathan Mayhew, the minister of the West Church, preached a violent sermon against the Stamp Act and its supporters, and the next day the house of the governor was broken into and its contents were destroyed.

Apparently the public sentiment condemned these violations of law and order, but the rioters though known were suffered to go unpunished.

The nature of the opposition to the Stamp Act is illustrated by the proceedings in Connecticut. Jared Ingersoll was appointed stamp master, and immediately he was required to resign. A friend, when endeavoring to conciliate the people

said, "Had you not rather that these duties would be collected by your brethren than by foreigners?"

"No, vile miscreant, indeed we had not," said one, "if your father must die is there no defect in filial duty in becoming his executioner, that the hangman's part of the estate may remain in the family?" "If the ruin of your country is decreed are you free from blame in taking part in the plunder?"

"The act is so contrived," said Ingersoll, "as to make it your interest to buy the stamps. When I undertook the office I intended a service to you."

"Stop advertising your wares until they come safe at market," he was answered. "The two first letters of his name," said one, "are those of the traitor of old. It was decreed our Saviour should suffer; but was it better for Judas Iscariot to betray him, so that the price of his blood might be saved by his friends?"

After much equivocation and with the fear of death upon him Ingersoll shouted "Liberty and property," three times and then resigned his office. The mob spirit evoked by the Stamp Act soon subsided and a calm determined purpose of resistance took its place. Surrounded by these violent and exciting scenes the dejected ones said, "North American liberty is dead." "She is dead," said those of more faith, "but happily she has left one son, the child of her bosom prophetically named Independence, now the hope of all when he shall come of age."

"I am clear on this point," said Mayhew, "that no people are under a religious obligation to be slaves, if they are able to set themselves at liberty."

This was in 1765, and from that time forth the spirit and purpose of independence animated and controlled the repre-

sentative men and the organs of public sentiment in every part of the country. It was during the existence of the Stamp Act and pending the measures of oppression which followed its repeal, that declarations were made and measures adopted of the greatest importance to the cause of American independence.

It was then that Patrick Henry, speaking for the Assembly of Virginia, declared "that every attempt to vest the power of taxation in any person or persons whatsoever, other than the said assembly, has a manifest tendency to destroy British as well as American freedom; that he proposed by resolution that the Colony of Virginia be immediately put into a state of defence, and that a committee should be appointed to prepare a plan for embodying, arming, and disciplining such a number of men as may be sufficient for that purpose;" that in the memorable debate on the resolution, in the language if not with the spirit of prophecy, he declared it vain to indulge the fond hope of peace and reconciliation, that an appeal to arms and to the God of Hosts was all that was left; that John Morin Scott of New York said if the mother country deny to the colonies the right of making their own laws and disposing of their own property by representatives of their own choosing then the connection between them ought to cease and sooner or later it must inevitably cease; that the Sons of Liberty of the city of New York as early as the 7th day of January, 1766, forecast the American union in the declaration that "there was safety for the colonies only in the firm union of the whole;" that the assembly of New York declared that that "colony lawfully and constitutionally has and enjoys an internal legislature of its own, in which the crown and the people of this colony are constitutionally represented, and the power and authority

of the said legislature cannot lawfully or constitutionally be suspended, abridged, abrogated, or annulled by any power, authority, or prerogative whatsoever;" that the Committee of One Hundred of the city of New York, upon the receipt of the news of the massacre on Lexington Green, resolves that all the horrors of civil war would never compel America to submit to taxation by authority of Parliament; that the assembly demanded "exemption from the burdens of ungranted, involuntary taxes as the grand principle of every free State," and as "without such a right vested in the people themselves there can be no liberty, no happiness, no security;" that Mr. Jefferson said, "We want neither inducement nor power to declare and assert a separation; we are reduced to the tyranny of irritable masters or resistance by force;" that the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the county "of Hanover, Virginia, instructed its delegates to assent to such measures as would produce the hearty union of all their countrymen and sister colonies;" that William Hooper, of North Carolina, early in 1774, declared that "the colonies are striding fast to independency and will ere long build an empire on the ruins of Britain, will adopt its constitution purged of its impurities and, from an experience of its defects, will guard against those evils which have wasted its vigor and brought it to an untimely end;" that the same State, the 12th day of April, 1776, empowered its delegates to "declare independency;" that Joseph Hawley of Massachusetts asserted that "independence was the only way to union and harmony;" that General Greene in 1775 recommended a Declaration of Independence; that Samuel Adams said, "I am perfectly satisfied of the necessity of a public and explicit Declaration of Independence;" that the press of Philadelphia declared that "none in this day of liberty will

say that duty binds us to yield obedience to any man or body of men, forming part of the British constitution when they exceed the limits prescribed by that constitution; that the Stamp Act is unconstitutional and no more obligatory than a decree of the Divan of Turkey;" that the town of Boston said,—and may their words be remembered,—" We are not afraid of poverty, but we disdain slavery;" that the county of Suffolk in 1774 resolved, " that no obedience is due from this province to either or any part of the obnoxious acts;" that Middlesex, speaking for the men of Lexington, Concord, and Bunker Hill, said, " We are sensible that he can never die too soon who lays down his life in support of the laws and liberties of his country;" that the Continental Congress of 1774 sent forth its immortal remonstrances, memorials, manifestoes, and addresses to the king, to Parliament, to the people of England, to the people of Ireland, to their brethren of Canada, and to the colonies of America; that ancient hostilities were forgotten, that local barriers were broken down, the spirit of union fostered and the colonies made one in purpose and in destiny; and finally, that the formal and authoritative Declaration of Independence introduced an era of freedom, not for this country and people only, but ultimately, for all who shall speak the English language.

Thus does it appear from this array of facts, gathered from an era of a century and a half, that the independence of the American colonies had a slow growth, but its progress was perceptible, and from the year 1764 there could have been no ground for doubt as to the ultimate result. When the Declaration came the country was prepared to give it a substantial if not a united support.

The controversy and the contest were carried on by young men and by men in the meridian period of life. Jefferson

was in his thirty-fourth year. Washington was his senior by only eleven years, and it is said of the signers of the Declaration that their average age was less than forty years.

It is a remarkable but a well-authenticated phenomenon in human history that when the minds of many men are directed to one subject they often arrive at similar results and find similar modes of expression. This peculiarity has been observed in purely scientific researches, and it is more probable that it should have existed in the controversy preceding the independence of these colonies. It is not a marvel then, nor in disparagement of Mr. Jefferson or of the Congress of 1776, that the historian is compelled to admit that the Declaration of Independence is but the last and best expression of the sentiment and purposes of colonial America.

The rights and grievances of the colonies had been set forth by the Congress of 1774; the doctrine of the equality of all men, not as a theory merely, but in the substance of their natural, political rights, had been enunciated by Otis; and the citizens of Mecklenburg, North Carolina, had anticipated the Declaration of Jefferson and in some respects its exact language, and yet there is no reason to believe that the substance of the document was known to any member of Congress, and there is much evidence that neither Mr. Jefferson nor any one of his colleagues of the committee was aware of its existence.

The great merit of the Declaration of Independence is in this: That it asserted with unrivalled precision and power what the country had resolved and what it was prepared to maintain. It proclaimed the natural rights of men; it embodied the history of colonial America and it set forth the nature of the oppressions that the colonists had endured, the sacrifices they had made, the loyalty they had exhibited,

their poverty and forbearance all crowned by a statement of their purposes in the future. The colonies were represented by Mr. Jefferson, of Virginia; Mr. Robert R. Livingston, of New York; John Adams, of Massachusetts; Dr. Franklin, of Pennsylvania, and Roger Sherman, of Connecticut.

The draft as prepared by Mr. Jefferson was as remarkable for what was omitted finally, upon the suggestion of Georgia and South Carolina, as for what was preserved. As prepared by Mr. Jefferson and agreed to by the committee the king of Great Britain was denounced for the crime of perpetuating the traffic in African slaves.

In the year 1774 North Carolina resolved not to import nor purchase slaves; the county of Hanover, Virginia, had pronounced the African trade in slaves "most dangerous to the virtue and welfare of the country;" the Congress of 1774 had discountenanced the trade in slaves, and James Otis with nervous eloquence had denounced the whole system of human bondage.

As we turn from the consideration of the main theme of the occasion a restatement of the leading thoughts may not be inappropriate:

When the colonists laid the foundations of their respective governments they asserted those doctrines of political and personal freedom which constituted finally the legal and moral basis of the Revolution; and although in their weakness they submitted to acts which in their view were oppressive they never recognized the authority of the British Parliament, but upon their records and during a period of nearly a century and a half they asserted and as far as practicable they maintained their independence as political organizations.

The laws which they annulled or evaded were enacted by an assembly whose authority they never acknowledged and in which they were not represented.

Our fathers were careful to maintain their loyalty to the king as the sovereign of the British Empire and to perform all their duties as members of that empire, that the injustice of others might not have root in their own errors and wrongs.

The American Union did not originate in the present constitution, nor even in the articles of confederation; but it is elementary in the history of the country, and as far as we can judge it is essential to our form of liberty.

From 1643, when the union was formed between Massachusetts, New Plymouth, Connecticut and New Haven for "their own mutual safety and welfare," with the name "The United Colonies of New England," there seems never to have been a moment when the idea of union did not exist in the public mind. Union was the necessity of their weakness, as it now is the emblem of our origin and the source of our strength.

I turn now from this array of ancient facts; in conclusion I may direct your thoughts to some of the possibilities of the future. We are now passing from the first to the second century of our national existence. In 1790 the United States had less than 4,000,000 inhabitants, and in 1890 our population will be largely in excess of 60,000,000. We rank as the third nation on the globe if we consider only the number of persons dwelling upon contiguous territory, and in less than half a century we shall stand in the second place.

Our population is at least fifteen times as great as it was a hundred years ago, but we must not assume upon the same ratio of increase for the next century. Relatively there will be a decrease in the number of immigrants, and it is quite

probable that the spirit of enterprise or the love of adventure will carry away the successors of our frontier population to Africa and South America, the continents of the future. At the present rate of increase our population in the year 2000 would exceed 800,000,000, and if the ratio of increase should fall to fifteen per cent in each decennial period the course for the year 2000 will show an aggregate of about 280,000,000.

Whether so vast a population can be sustained within our present limits is a problem of the future, but for one I entertain no doubt that the sustaining force of the United States is adequate to the support of 400,000,000 inhabitants without any impairment of the enjoyments and comforts of social and domestic life. If we assume the habitable area of the United States to be 2,500,000 square miles, an average population of 300 to the square mile, the present average of the State of Massachusetts, would give an aggregate of 750,000,000 souls. And our capacity may be further measured by considering the fact that if the present inhabitants of the United States could be transferred to the State of Texas the average would not exceed 300 persons to the square mile.

And these statements even do not measure and limit the possibilities of comfortable existence on this continent. The diversification of human pursuits, due to science, art, and a wise public policy, is making constant and appreciable additions to the capacity of this globe to sustain human life. The 60,000,000 within our limits are better fed, better clothed, better housed than were the 2,500,000 who inaugurated the Revolutionary War.

Popular education enlarges the views and elevates the aspirations of the masses of men and women, and it also in-

creases their opportunities for advancement and comfort in life.

We may also rely with much confidence upon the simplicity of our system of land titles and the facility with which the soil may be conveyed from one party to another. With the increase of population and of wealth there will be an increasing tendency to make investments in land, and consequently there will be an ever-increasing peril from agrarian controversies. These may be controlled in some degree if not averted altogether by taking security against the existence of land monopolies, and by limiting the possessions of business corporations, of educational, charitable and eleemosynary institutions, and of churches to such areas as may be necessary to the performance of the duties imposed upon them. In all countries the landless classes are the dangerous classes, and it is therefore a wise public policy to encourage the possession of land even though the holdings should be small and in value relatively insignificant. Every title deed is security for the public peace. By the fable of Antæus we are taught that whoever touches the earth becomes strong, and by experience we are taught that whoever owns the earth becomes quiet minded and patriotic.

Henceforth the attention of this country will be withdrawn from Europe by degrees and it will be directed to Canada, Mexico, Central and South America, and the continent of Asia. In the arts and in manufactures Europe is our competitor, but in these departments we are without a rival upon this continent. Our future greatness as a manufacturing and trading nation must rest chiefly upon the kindly dispositions of the Asiatic peoples, upon the development of this continent and the constant friendship of the States and communities between the two great oceans.

I am confident that we have as a nation passed the period when the maxim "in peace prepare for war" was a necessary condition of our public life. First of all we should never indulge the thought of acquiring territory by aggressive means. Not that an honorable extension of the territory of the Union would be unwise under all circumstances, but a war for the enlargement of our dominion would be an unjust war in the very nature of the case.

Our position and influence in the affairs of the world for all purposes consistent with the rights of other nations depend no longer upon the exhibition of military force either upon the sea or upon the land.

We are separated by vast oceans from the great powers of the world; our trade is so valuable that neither England, France, nor Germany can forego its advantages for a single month; and our resources in men and in money are so ample that we may rely confidently upon the forbearance of those rulers from whom we may not be able even to command respect.

In this aspect of the future of the republic I do not accept the opinion that a wise public policy requires us to enter upon the construction of a seagoing navy in competition with the great nations of Europe that exist only under the constant menace of war. Better will it be for us to employ our resources in the construction of small, fast-sailing steamships to be employed in the transportation of the mails to and from all the principal ports of Central and South America and the eastern parts of Asia, thus opening new avenues through which the enterprise and business of the country may have free course.

The time has passed when the fate or the fortunes of nations were dependent upon naval battles lost or won. For

the future a war on the ocean is a war on commerce, and for such a war the heavily armored vessels of great navies are worthless utterly. Let science and skill furnish such protection to our sea coast cities as science and skill can command, but let us abandon the thought of constructing great navies at a cost of tens of millions on tens of millions for anticipated war on the open sea or as aids to the conquest of foreign lands. Let republican America, warned and instructed by the lesson which downtrodden Europe teaches, enter upon its second century with the purpose of demonstrating the truth that a government in which the people rule may be at once peaceful, powerful, and just.

# WILLIAM M. EVARTS




WILLIAM MAXWELL EVARTS, LL. D., eminent American statesman, jurist, and orator, was born at Boston, Feb. 6, 1818, and died at New York city, Feb. 28, 1901. Educated at Yale University, he studied law at the Harvard law school, was admitted to the Bar of New York, and began practice in the latter city in 1841. He soon became known as learned in his profession, being frequently consulted by other lawyers in difficult cases, and was district attorney in New York city (1849-53). He took an active interest in political affairs and was one of the earliest members of the Republican party. He was chief counsel for President Johnson in the impeachment trial of the latter, and from July, 1868, to March, 1869, was Attorney-General of the United States. In 1872, Evarts was counsel for the United States in the Geneva arbitration tribunal respecting the "Alabama" claims, and in 1875 was senior counsel for Henry Ward Beecher in the famous Tilton-Beecher case. He appeared for the Republican party before the Electoral Commission in 1877, and held the post of Secretary of State during the administration of President Hayes. From 1885 to 1891 he was a member of the United States Senate. He was a brilliant speaker and an eloquent orator, and was greatly in request at high social functions, and on occasions such as the unveiling of statues of Webster and Seward at New York. Among his notable orations are his eulogy on Chief-Justice Chase in 1873, his address at the opening of the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia (1876), besides those delivered before many prominent societies. Several of his important addresses have been separately published.


## WHAT THE AGE OWES TO AMERICA

FROM CENTENNIAL ORATION DELIVERED AT PHILADELPHIA, JULY 4, 1876

FELLOW CITIZENS,—The event which to-day we commemorate supplies its own reflections and enthusiasms and brings its own plaudits. They do not at all hang on the voice of the speaker nor do they greatly depend upon the contracts and associations of the place. The Declaration of American Independence was when it occurred a capital transaction in human affairs; as such it has kept its place in history; as such it will maintain itself while human interest in human institutions shall endure. The scene and the actors for their profound impression upon the



WILLIAM M. EVARTS



world at the time and ever since have owed nothing to dramatic effects, nothing to epical exaggerations.

To the eye there was nothing wonderful, or vast, or splendid, or pathetic in the movement or the display. Imagination or art can give no sensible grace or decoration to the persons, the place, or the performance which made up the business of that day. The worth and the force that belong to the agents and the action rest wholly on the wisdom, the courage, and the faith that formed and executed the great design, and the potency and permanence of its operation upon the affairs of the world, which, as foreseen and legitimate consequences, followed.

The dignity of the act is the deliberate, circumspect, open, and serene performance by these men in the clear light of day, and by a concurrent purpose of a civic duty, which embraced the greatest hazards to themselves and to all the people from whom they held this disputed discretion, but which to their sober judgments promised benefits to that people and their posterity from generation to generation exceeding these hazards and commensurate with its own fitness.

The question of their conduct is to be measured by the actual weight and pressure of the manifold considerations which surrounded the subject before them and by the abundant evidence that they comprehended their vastness and variety. By a voluntary and responsible choice they willed to do what was done and what without their will would not have been done.

Thus estimated, the illustrious act covers all who participated in it with its own renown and makes them forever conspicuous among men, as it is forever famous among events. And thus the signers of the Declaration of our Independence

"wrote their names where all nations should behold them and all time should not efface them." It was "in the course of human events" intrusted to them to determine whether the fulness of time had come when a nation should be born in a day. They declared the independence of a new nation in the sense in which men declare emancipation or declare war; the Declaration created what was declared.

Famous always among men are the founders of States, and fortunate above all others in such fame are these, our fathers, whose combined wisdom and courage began the great structure of our national existence, and laid sure the foundations of liberty and justice on which it rests. Fortunate, first, in the clearness of their title and in the world's acceptance of their rightful claim. Fortunate, next, in the enduring magnitude of the State they founded and the beneficence of its protection of the vast interests of human life and happiness, which have here had their home. Fortunate, again, in the admiring imitation of their work, which the institutions of the most powerful and most advanced nations more and more exhibit; and, last of all, fortunate in the full demonstration of our later time, that their work is adequate to withstand the most disastrous storms of human fortunes, and survives unwrecked, unshaken, and unharmed.

This day has now been celebrated by a great people at each recurrence of its anniversary for a hundred years, with every form of ostentatious joy, with every demonstration of respect and gratitude for the ancestral virtue which gave it its glory, and with the firmest faith that growing time should neither obscure its lustre nor reduce the ardor, nor discredit the sincerity of its observance. A reverent spirit has explored the lives of the men who took part in the great transaction; has unfolded their characters and exhibited to an ad-

mirring posterity the purity of their motives; the sagacity, the bravery, the fortitude, and the perseverance which marked their conduct, and which secured the prosperity and permanence of their work.

Philosophy has divined the secrets of all this power and eloquence emblazoned the magnificence of its results. The heroic war which fought out the acquiescence of the Old World in the independence of the New; the manifold and masterly forms of noble character, and of patient and serene wisdom which the great influences of the times begat; the large and splendid scale on which these elevated purposes were wrought out and the majestic proportions to which they have been filled up; the unended line of eventful progress, casting ever backward a flood of light upon the sources of the original energy, and ever forward a promise and a prophecy of unexhausted power,—all these have been made familiar to our people by the genius and the devotion of historians and orators.

The greatest statesmen of the Old World for this same period of one hundred years have traced the initial step in these events, looked into the nature of the institutions thus founded, weighed by the Old-World wisdom and measured by recorded experience, the probable fortunes of this new adventure on an unknown sea. This circumspect and searching survey of our wide field of political and social experiment no doubt has brought them a diversity of judgment as to the past and of expectation as to the future. But of the magnitude and the novelty and the power of the forces set at work by the event we commemorate no competent authorities have ever greatly differed. The contemporary judgment of Burke is scarcely an over-statement of the European opinion of the immense import of American independence. He de-

clared: "A great revolution has happened—a revolution made, not by chopping and changing of power in any of the existing States, but by the appearance of a new State of a new species in a new part of the globe. It has made as great a change in all the relations and balances and gravitations of power as the appearance of a new planet would in the system of the solar world."

It is easy to understand that the rupture between the colonies and the mother country might have worked a result of political independence that would have involved no such mighty consequences as are here so strongly announced by the most philosophic statesman of his age. The resistance of the colonies, which came to a head in the revolt, was led in the name and for the maintenance of the liberties of Englishmen against parliamentary usurpation and a subversion of the British constitution.

A triumph of those liberties might have ended in an emancipation from the rule of the English Parliament and a continued submission to the scheme and system of the British monarchy, with an American Parliament adjusted thereto upon the true principles of the English constitution. Whether this new political establishment should have maintained loyalty to the British sovereign or should have been organized under a crown and throne of its own the transaction would then have had no other importance than such as belongs to a dismemberment of existing empire, but with preservation of existing institutions. There would have been to be sure a "new state," but not "of a new species," and that it was "in a new part of the globe" would have gone far to make the dismemberment but a temporary and circumstantial disturbance in the old and settled order of things.

Indeed, the solidity and perpetuity of that order might have been greatly confirmed by this propagation of the model of the European monarchies on the boundless regions of this continent. It is precisely here that the Declaration of Independence has its immense importance. As a civil act, and by the people's decree, and not by the achievement of the army or through military motives, at the first stage of the conflict it assigned a new nationality with its own institutions as the civilly pre-ordained end to be fought for and secured. It did not leave it to an after fruit of triumphant war, shaped and measured by military power, and conferred by the army of the people. This assured at the outset the supremacy of civil over military authority, the subordination of the army to the unarmed people.

This deliberative choice of the scope and goal of the Revolution made sure of two things which must have been always greatly in doubt if military reasons and events had held the mastery over the civil power. The first was that nothing less than the independence of the nation and its separation from the system of Europe would be attained if our arms were prosperous; and the second that the new nation would always be the mistress of its own institutions. This might not have been its fate had a triumphant army won the prize of independence, not as a task set for it by the people, and done in its service, but by its own might and held by its own title, and so to be shaped and dealt with by its own will.

There is the best reason to think that the Congress which declared our independence gave its chief solicitude, not to the hazards of military failure, not to the chance of miscarriage in the project of separation from England, but to the grave responsibility of the military success—of which they

made no doubt—and as to what should replace as government to the new nation the monarchy of England, which they considered as gone to them forever from the date of the Declaration.

Nor did this Congress feel any uncertainty, either in disposition or expectation, that the natural and necessary result would preclude the formation of the new government out of any other materials than such as were to be found in society as established on this side of the Atlantic. These materials they foresaw were capable of and would tolerate only such political establishments as would maintain and perpetuate the equality and liberty always enjoyed in the several colonial communities. But all these limitations upon what was possible still left a large range of anxiety as to what was probable and might become actual.

One thing was too essential to be left uncertain, and the founders of this nation determined that there never should be a moment when the several communities of the different colonies should lose the character of component parts of one nation. By their plantation and growth up to the day of the Declaration of Independence they were subjects of one sovereignty, bound together in one political connection, parts of one country, under one constitution, with one destiny. Accordingly the Declaration by its very terms made the act of separation a dissolving by “one people” of “the political bands that have connected them with another,” and the proclamation of the right and of the fact of independent nationality was “that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States.”

It was thus, that at one breath, “independence and union” were declared and established. The confirmation of the first by war, and of the second by civil wisdom, was but

the execution of the single design which it is the glory of this great instrument of our national existence to have framed and announced. The recognition of our independence, first by France, and then by Great Britain, the closer union by the Articles of Confederation and the final unity by the federal constitution were all but muniments of title of that "liberty and union, one and inseparable," which were proclaimed at this place and on this day one hundred years ago, which have been our possession from that moment hitherto, and which we surely avow shall be our possession forever. . . .

What half a century ago was hopefully prophesied for our far future goes out to its fulfilment. The prophecy then uttered has become a truth—a realization.

"As the sun rises one Sabbath morning and travels westward from Newfoundland to the Oregon, he will behold the countless millions assembling, as if by a common impulse, in the temples with which every valley, mountain, and plain will be adorned. The morning psalm and the evening anthem will commence with the multitudes on the Atlantic coast, be sustained by the loud chorus of ten thousand times ten thousand in the valley of the Mississippi, and be prolonged by the thousands of thousands on the shores of the Pacific."

What remains but to search the spirit of the laws of the land as framed by, and modeled to, the popular government to which our fortunes were committed by the Declaration of Independence? I do not mean to examine the particular legislation, State or general, by which the affairs of the people have been managed, sometimes wisely and well, at others feebly and ill, nor even the fundamental arrangement of political authority, or the critical treatment of great junctures in our policy and history. The hour and the occasion concur to preclude so intimate an inquiry.

The chief concern in this regard to us and to the rest of the world, is, whether the proud trust, the profound radicalism, the wide benevolence which spoke in the Declaration and were infused into the constitution at the first, have been in good faith adhered to by the people, and whether now these principles supply the living forces which sustain and direct government and society.

He who doubts needs but to look around to find all things full of the original spirit, and testifying to its wisdom and strength. We have taken no steps backward, nor have we needed to seek other paths in our progress than those in which our feet were planted at the beginning. Weighty and manifold have been our obligations to the great nations of the earth, to their scholars, their philosophers, their men of genius and of science, to their skill, their taste, their invention, to their wealth, their arts, their industry. But in the institutions and methods of government; in civil prudence, courage, or policy; in statesmanship, in the art of "making of a small town a great city," in the adjustment of authority to liberty; in the concurrence of reason and strength in peace, of force and obedience in war; we have found nothing to recall us from the course of our fathers, nothing to add to our safety or aid our progress in it.

So far from this all modifications of European politics accept the popular principles of our system and tend to our model. The movements toward equality of representation, enlargement of the suffrage, and public education in England; the restoration of unity in Italy; the confederation of Germany under the lead of Prussia; the actual republic in France; the unsteady throne of Spain; the new liberties of Hungary; the constant gain to the people's share in gov-

ernment throughout all Europe; all tend one way, the way pointed out in the Declaration of Independence.

The care and zeal with which our people cherish and invigorate the primary supports and defences of their own sovereignty have all the unswerving force and confidence of instincts. The community and publicity of education at the charge and as an institution of the State is firmly embedded in the wants and desires of the people. Common schools are rapidly extending through the only part of the country which has been shut against them, and follow close upon the footsteps of its new liberty to enlighten the enfranchised race. Freedom of conscience easily stamps out the first sparkles of persecution and snaps as green withes the first bonds of spiritual domination. The sacred oracles of their religion the people wisely hold in their own keeping as the keys of religious liberty, and refuse to be beguiled by the voice of the wisest charmer into loosing their grasp.

Freedom from military power and the maintenance of that arm of the government in the people; a trust in their own adequacy as soldiers when their duty as citizens should need to take on that form of service to the State; these have gained new force by the experience of foreign and civil war, and a standing army is a remoter possibility for this nation in its present or prospective greatness than it was in the days of its small beginnings.

But in the freedom of the press and the universality of the suffrage as maintained and exercised to-day throughout the length and breadth of the land we find the most conspicuous and decisive evidence of the unspent force of the institutions of liberty, and the jealous guard of its principal defences. These indeed are the great agencies and engines of the people's sovereignty. They hold the same relations

to the vast Democracy of modern society that the persuasions of the orators and the personal voices of the assembly did in the narrow confines of the Grecian States. The laws, the customs, the impulses, and sentiments of the people have given wider and wider range and license to the legislations of the press, multiplied and more frequent occasions for the exercise of the suffrage, larger and larger communication of its franchise.

The progress of a hundred years finds these prodigious activities in the fullest play—incessant and all powerful—indispensable in the habits of the people and impregnable in their affections. The public service and their subordination to the public safety stand in their play upon one another, and in their freedom thus maintained. Neither could long exist in true vigor in our system without the other. Without the watchful, omnipresent, and indomitable energy of the press the suffrage would languish, would be subjugated by the corporate power of the legions of placemen which the administration of the affairs of a great nation imposes upon it and fall a prey to that “vast patronage which” we are told, “distracted, corrupted, and finally subverted the Roman Republic.”

On the other hand, if the impressions of the press upon the opinions and passions of the people found no settled and ready mode of their working out through the frequent and peaceful suffrage, the people would be driven to satisfy their displeasure at government or their love of change to the coarse methods of barricades and batteries, by the force of arms, as it were.

We cannot then hesitate to declare that the original principles of equal society and popular government still inspire the laws, live in the habits of the people and animate their

purposes and their hopes. These principles have not lost their spring or elasticity. They have sufficed for all the methods of government in the past; we feel no fear for their adequacy in the future. Released now from the tasks and burdens of the formative period, these principles and methods can be directed with undivided force to the everyday conduct of government, to the staple and steady virtues of administration.

The feebleness of crowding the statute-books with unexecuted laws; the danger of power outgrowing or evading responsibility, the rashness and fickleness of temporary expedients, the constant tendency by which parties decline into factions and end in conspiracies, all these mischiefs beset all governments and are part of the life of each generation. To deal with these evils, the tasks and burdens of the immediate future, the nation needs no other resources than the principles and the examples which our past history supply. These principles, these examples of our fathers, are the strength and the safety of our State to-day: *Moribus antiquis, stat res Romana, virisque.*

Unity, liberty, power, prosperity—these are our possessions to-day. Our territory is safe against foreign dangers; its completeness dissuades from further ambition to extend it, and its rounded symmetry discourages all attempts to dismember it. No division into greatly unequal parts would be tolerable to either. No imaginable union of interests or passions large enough to include one half the country, but must embrace much more. The madness of partition into numerous and feeble fragments could proceed only from the hopeless degradation of the people, and would form but an incident in the general ruin.

The spirit of the nation is at the highest—its triumph over

the inborn, inbred perils of the constitution has chased away all fears, justified all hopes and with universal joy we greet this day. We have not proved unworthy of a great ancestry; we have had the virtue to uphold what they so wisely, so firmly established. With these proud possessions of the past, with powers matured, with principles settled, with habits formed, the nation passes as it were from preparatory growth to responsible development of character and the steady performance of duty. What labors await it, what trials shall attend it, what triumphs for human nature, what glory for itself, are prepared for this people in the coming century, we may not presume to foretell. "One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth forever," and we reverently hope that these, our constituted liberties, shall be maintained to the unending line of our posterity and so long as the earth itself shall endure.

# SIR LEONARD TILLEY



SIR SAMUEL LEONARD TILLEY, K.C.M.G., Canadian statesman and financier, was born at Gagetown, New Brunswick, May 8, 1818, and died at St. John, New Brunswick, June 25, 1896. He attended the grammar school in his native town for some years, but at the age of twelve was apprenticed to an apothecary, and subsequently set up in business as a druggist. Before setting out in public life, he joined a debating society and was a warm advocate of temperance, remaining a total abstainer all his life. In 1850, he entered the New Brunswick legislature as member for St. John, and for the remainder of his career was rarely out of public life. From 1857 to 1865 he was premier of the province of New Brunswick, and after the union of the British provinces in the Dominion of Canada he was appointed the first minister of customs in the Dominion cabinet. He subsequently held the posts of minister of public works and minister of finance, and was lieutenant-governor of New Brunswick, 1873-78. During the administration of Sir John A. Macdonald, he was again minister of finance, 1878-85, and in 1879 received the honor of knighthood. On account of ill health he retired from the cabinet in the summer of 1885, but in the following November was persuaded to accept the post of lieutenant-governor of New Brunswick for a second period, holding office until 1893. Sir Leonard Tilley during his long public career instituted many public measures of importance, the chief of which was the act relating to the readjustment and reorganization of the customs tariff, besides taking an active and prominent part in bringing about Canadian Federation.

## ON NATIONAL POLICY

DELIVERED MARCH 14, 1879

M R. CHAIRMAN,—It is only recently that I have quite realized the great changes that have taken place throughout the Dominion of Canada since I last had the honor of a seat in Parliament. To-day I fully realize them, and the increased difficulties devolving upon me as finance minister, compared with the position of affairs when I submitted my financial statement in 1873. Then my work was a very easy one indeed. Honorable ministers on the opposite benches were pleased on that occasion to compliment

me on that statement, but I felt that I had earned no compliment, that if that speech was acceptable to the House it was because of the satisfactory statements I was able to make with reference to the condition of the Dominion and also of the finances of the Dominion.

Then, sir, I was able to point to steady and increasing surpluses and revenue, and that too in the face of a steady reduction of taxation. Then I was able to point with some degree of confidence to the prospective expenditures of the Dominion, extending over ten years. To-day I cannot speak of it with the same confidence. Then the construction of the Pacific railway was under regulations that confined and limited the liabilities of the Dominion to \$30,000,000. To-day I am not in a position to say what expenditure or responsibilities we may incur with reference to that great undertaking. There has been a change in the policy.

But it will become the duty of the government and of Parliament to consider, while we have not the limit to our liabilities that we had, whether we cannot by some means construct that great work largely out of the 200,000,000 acres of land lying within the wheat area of that magnificent country.

Then, sir, I could point with pride and with satisfaction to the increased capital of our banks and the large dividend they paid. To-day I regret to say that we must point to depreciated values and to small dividends. Then I could point to the general prosperity of the country. To-day we must all admit that it is greatly depressed. Then I could point with satisfaction to the various manufacturing industries that were in operation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion remunerative to the men who had invested their capital in them and giving employment to tens of thousands.

To-day many of the furnaces are cold, the machinery in many cases is idle, and those establishments that are in operation are only employed half time and are scarcely paying the interest on the money invested.

Then, sir, we could point to the agricultural interest as most prosperous, with a satisfactory home market and satisfactory prices abroad. To-day they have a limited market with low prices and anything but a satisfactory market abroad. Then, sir, we could point to a very valuable and extensive West India trade; to-day it does not exist. Then, sir, we could point to a profitable and direct tea trade that has been demoralized and destroyed. Then everything appeared to be prosperous; to-day, though it looks gloomy, I hope there is a silver lining to the cloud, that we may yet see illuminating the whole of the Dominion and changing our present position to one of happiness and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, there has been, and very naturally so, a good deal of interest and anxiety manifested on the part of the friends of the National Policy, as it is called, in regard to its early introduction. I can quite understand that, because, believing as they do, and as a majority of this House do, that that policy is calculated to bring prosperity to the country, it was but natural that they should be anxious for its introduction and that not a day should be lost.

And it is satisfactory to know that, great and difficult as is the responsibility which rests upon me here, I may trust that the proposition I am about to submit will be sustained, not only by a majority of this House but by an overwhelming majority in the country.

It was natural therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the friends of this policy should be anxious for its introduction, and it was pleasing and satisfactory to see that even the opposition

vied with the friends of the government in that anxiety. It is most encouraging to me, because of course all oppositions are patriotic, and certainly a patriotic opposition anxious for the introduction of this measure could not have desired that a bad measure and one not calculated to benefit the country should be forced hastily upon it. Therefore, I take it for granted that in addition to the support from the gentlemen behind me we shall have the support of the gentlemen opposite to our policy and the propositions we are about to submit.

But perhaps it will not be out of place for me to offer a few remarks in justification of the apparent delay that has taken place. It will be remembered that the government was only formed on October 19th. Some delay took place in awaiting the arrival in Canada of an honorable member who, I am satisfied, is one whom, whatever the political opinions of gentlemen of this House may be, all would have been anxious to see consulted before the government was formed—I mean the minister of militia. The government therefore was not completed till October 19th. The members of the government had to return for re-election, and those elections, though they were hastened with all possible rapidity, because we felt there was a great deal of work to be done, were not over until the early part of November when we returned to the city of Ottawa.

And what did we find? As minister of finance, I cannot say I found the finances in the most satisfactory condition I found, sir, that we had maturing in London between the early part of November and January 1st, an indebtedness of \$15,500,000, with nothing to meet it but the prospective payment of the fishery award. On this side of the Atlantic we had in the various banks of the Dominion something like

\$5,000,000, and between that date and January 1st, with the subsidy of the provinces, and payments to contractors who were constructing public works, something like \$3,000,000 had to be paid; and then, considering the position the banks were in all over the Dominion, the uncertainty as to what might transpire, it was just possible that a reduction in the reserves might take place, and that meant a demand on the Dominion treasury. Every dollar we found it necessary to take from the banks at the time was embarrassing and was reluctantly withdrawn. But it was inevitable that the finance minister should proceed to London with the least possible delay that arrangements might be made to sustain the credit and the honor of the Dominion. Well, sir, in order to avoid that, feeling the importance of every member of the government being at his post in order to prepare measures for the meeting of Parliament, a cable message was sent to our agents on the other side to ask if the journey of the finance minister to London could not be avoided. The answer was "No; his presence here is absolutely necessary." Under these circumstances I proceeded to London, and I placed a loan of £3,000,000 sterling upon the market there.

Then, sir, after my return to Canada it became necessary that we should consider the whole question of the tariff. It is not a question that can be settled in a day. It is not a question that can be settled intelligently in weeks, indeed it would have been well if we could have had more time to consider it than we have had, considering the magnitude and importance of the work. I can appeal to other finance ministers, and especially to my immediate predecessor, who in 1874 made several changes in the tariff of that day, to speak of the difficulties there are in making even as few changes as were then made.

But if we undertake, as the present government have undertaken, to readjust and reorganize, and, I may say, make an entirely new tariff having for its object not only the realization of \$2,000,000 more revenue than will be collected this year, but in addition to providing for that deficiency, to adjust the tariff with a view of giving effect to what has been and is to-day declared to be the policy of the majority of this House—I mean the protection of the industries of the country—the magnitude of the undertaking will be the better appreciated.

Sir, we have invited gentlemen from all parts of the Dominion and representing all interests in the Dominion to assist us in the re-adjustment of the tariff, because we did not feel—though perhaps we possess an average intelligence in ordinary government matters—we did not feel that we knew everything. We did not feel that we were prepared, without advice and assistance from men of experience with reference to these matters, to readjust and make a judicious tariff.

We therefore invited those who were interested in the general interests of the country or interested in any special interests. Gentlemen who took an opposite view met us and discussed these questions, and I may say that down to as late a period as yesterday, though the propositions are submitted to-day, we were favored with the co-operation and opinion of gentlemen who represent their particular or general views with reference to the great questions we have under consideration.

We have labored zealously and arduously, and I trust it will be found successfully; and we are now about to submit our views for the consideration of this House. I think we may appeal with some degree of confidence to gentlemen in

opposition, in approval of the early period at which this tariff is being introduced, when I call to the mind of these honorable gentlemen that their government was formed on November 7, 1873; ours on October 19th; that my predecessor did not submit his tariff and budget speech until April 14th, this being March 14th.

When we submit to this House the result of our deliberations you will all understand the nature and extent of the consideration that must necessarily have been given to them. I trust that this House and the country will feel that we have presented our views at as early a period as possible, taking all these facts into consideration.

Let me refer to some circumstances that led to the present depression in the revenue. During and after the war in the United States it is well understood that that country lost a large portion of its export trade, and its manufacturing industries were to a certain extent paralyzed; and it was only about 1872 or 1873 that they really commenced to restore their manufacturing industries and endeavored to find an extended market elsewhere for the manufactures of their country.

Lying as we do alongside that great country we were looked upon as a desirable market for their surplus products, and our American neighbors, always competent to judge of their own interests and act wisely in regard to them, put forth every effort to obtain access to our market. It is well known by the term slaughter-market what they have been doing for the last four or five years in Canada; that in order to find an outlet for their surplus manufactures they have been willing to send them into this country at any price that would be a little below that of the Canadian manufacturer.

It is well known also that they had their agents in every part of the Dominion seeking purchasers for their surplus, and that those agents have been enabled under our existing laws to enter those goods at a price much lower than they ought to have paid, which was their value in the place of purchase. It is well known moreover that the United States government, in order to encourage special interests in that country, granted a bounty upon certain manufactures and so gave to them the exclusive market of the Dominion, and under those circumstances we have lost a very important trade, possessed previous to 1873. In addition to the loss of the West India trade by the repeal of the ten per cent on tea we lost the direct tea trade and all the advantages resulting from it, by its transfer from the Dominion to New York and Boston.

Under all those circumstances and with the high duty imposed by the United States on the agricultural products of the Dominion, by which we are to a great extent excluded from them while the manufactures of that country are forced into our market, we could not expect prosperity or success in the Dominion so long as that state of things continued. These are some of the difficulties which have led to our present state of affairs.

Now, after having made these few remarks on that head, I desire to call the attention of the House to the remedy. I know this is a difficult question—that it is the opinion of some honorable members that no matter what proposition you may make or what legislation you introduce it cannot improve or increase the prosperity of the country. The government entertain a different opinion. I may say at the outset it would have been much more agreeable if we could have met the House without the necessity of increased taxa-

tion. But in the imposition of the duties we are now about to ask the House to impose, it may be said we shall receive from the imports from foreign countries a larger portion of the \$2,000,000 we require than we shall receive from the mother country.

I believe such will be the effect, but I think that in making such a statement to this House, belonging as we do to and forming a part of that great country—a country that receives our natural products without any taxation, everything we have to send to her—apart from our national feelings, I think this House will not object if, in the propositions before me, they touch more heavily the imports from foreign countries than from our fatherland.

I have this to say to our American friends: In 1865 they abrogated the reciprocity treaty, and from that day to the present a large portion of the imports from that country into the Dominion have been admitted free. We have hoped and hoped in vain that by the adoption of that policy we would lead our American friends to treat us in a more liberal spirit with regard to the same articles. Well, after having waited twelve years for the consideration of this subject, the government, requiring more revenue, have determined to ask this House to impose upon the products of the United States that have been free such a duty as may seem consistent with our position.

But the government couple with the proposal, in order to show that we approach this question with no unfriendly spirit, a resolution that will be laid on the table containing a proposition to this effect: That as to articles named, which are the natural products of the country, including lumber, if the United States take off the duties in part or in whole, we are prepared to meet them with equal concessions. The

government believe in a reciprocity tariff, yet may discuss free trade or protection, but the question of to-day is: Shall we have a reciprocity tariff or a one-sided tariff?

We found, as I stated before, that it was important to encourage the exportation of our manufactures to foreign countries, and we are prepared now to say that the policy of the government is to give every manufacturer in the Dominion of Canada a drawback on the duties they may pay upon goods used in the manufactures of the Dominion exported. We found also, sir, as I have already pointed out, that under the bounty system of some foreign countries our sugar-refining trade and other interests were materially affected.

Well, sir, the government have decided to ask this House to impose countervailing duties under such circumstances. I trust that this proposition will receive the support of both sides of the House, because some six months since when the deputation of sugar refiners in London waited upon Mr. Gladstone and Sir Stafford Northcote, both of them being gentlemen representing free-trade views, they declared in the most emphatic terms that when a government came in and thus interfered with the legitimate trade of the country they were prepared to impose countervailing duties.

To make this matter plain, and place it beyond dispute, the government propose to ask the House for authority to collect on all such articles an ad valorem duty on their value, irrespective of drawbacks. My colleagues say explain it. For instance, a cent and a quarter drawback per pound is granted on cut nails exported to the Dominion of Canada; the duty will be calculated on the value of the nails irrespective of that drawback. Now, a bounty is given on sugar in excess of the duty which is paid by the sugar refiners;

the government will exact an ad valorem duty on the value of that sugar irrespective of the drawback.

I may also state, Mr. Chairman, that another reason why I think our American neighbors should not object to the imposition of the duties we propose is this: It is a fact, though not generally known, that the average percentage of revenue that is imposed on all imports into the Dominion of Canada at the present time, taking the returns for last year as our criterion, is 13 3-4 per cent. The amount of duty collected on the imports from Great Britain is a fraction under 17 1-2 per cent; while the amount of duty collected on the imports from the United States is a fraction under 10 per cent.

[After dealing minutely with the changes which would be effected by the new tariff, Mr. Tilley concluded as follows:]

It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, and I think the House will agree with me, that the government have endeavored, whether successfully or not, to carry out the policy that we were pledged to inaugurate. We have endeavored to meet every possible interest—the mining, the manufacturing, and the agricultural interests. We have endeavored to assist our shipping and ship-building interest, which is in a very depressed condition.

We have endeavored not to injure the lumber interest, because they now have a very important article used by their people at about the same rate of duty they had it before—I refer to pork. They have tea at a cheaper price than before; they have molasses cheaper. These articles enter largely into consumption with them. They have, as have every other class of exporters in the Dominion, many advantages under the propositions that we are about to submit that they did not have before. In the interest of lumbermen and of commerce generally, the present government, as well as our

predecessors, have expended large sums of money for the improvement of the navigation of our rivers and of our coast by the erection of lighthouses and in their maintenance. This of course is an advantage to the shipping interests as well.

A proposition is also to be submitted to the House which you will find in the estimates, to extend a telegraph down the St. Lawrence. This proposition was submitted to the people of the Dominion by an able and experienced gentleman, a member of the House. I need not name him because the interest he has taken is well known. This proposition is in the interest of commerce, and of our shipping, and of humanity. It is the interest of every industry that exports any article from this country to the Old World, because an expenditure of this kind will reduce the rate of charges in the shape of insurance and other charges on the shipping, and that is more absolutely in the interest of the exporter than in the interest of the owner of the ship.

In our policy, as just propounded, we have dealt with the agricultural interest, the mining interest, the shipping interest, indirectly with the lumbering interest, and with very many other interests, and it does appear to me that we have now arrived at a time when it becomes necessary for this country, for this Parliament, to decide whether we are to remain in the position we now occupy, with a certainty that within two years, with the existing laws upon our statute-book, almost every manufacturing industry in the country will be closed up and the money invested in it lost. The time has arrived, I think, when it becomes our duty to decide whether the thousands of men throughout the length and breadth of this country who are unemployed shall seek employment in another country or shall find it in this Dominion;

the time has arrived when we are to decide whether we will be simply hewers of wood and drawers of water; whether we will be simply agriculturists raising wheat, and lumbermen producing more lumber than we can use or Great Britain and the United States will take from us at remunerative prices; whether we will confine our attention to the fisheries and certain other small industries, and cease to be what we have been, and not rise to be what I believe we are destined to be under wise and judicious legislation,—or whether we will inaugurate a policy that will by its provisions say to the industries of the country, we will give you sufficient protection; we will give you a market for what you can produce; we will say that while our neighbors build up a Chinese wall we will impose a reasonable duty on their products coming into this country; at all events we will maintain for agricultural and other productions largely the market of our own Dominion.

The time has certainly arrived when we must consider whether we will allow matters to remain as they are, with the result of being an unimportant and uninteresting portion of her Majesty's dominions, or will rise to the position which I believe Providence has destined us to occupy, by means which, I believe, though I may be over-sanguine; which my colleagues believe, though they may be over-sanguine; which the country believes, are calculated to bring prosperity and happiness to the people, to give employment to the thousands who are unemployed, and to make this a great and prosperous country, as we all desire and hope it will be.

# BENJAMIN F. BUTLER



ENJAMIN FRANKLIN BUTLER, American general, politician, and lawyer, was born at Deerfield, N. H., Nov. 5, 1818, and died at Washington, D. C., Jan. 11, 1893. Receiving his education at Waterville College (now Colby University), he studied law, was admitted to the Bar in 1841, and

began practice in Lowell, Mass. Here he soon built up a large and lucrative business and acquired at the same time a considerable reputation as a lawyer, especially in his conduct of criminal cases. He was active in political affairs, entering the lower house of the State legislature as a Democratic member in 1853, and the State senate in 1859. When the Civil War broke out, he was a brigadier-general of the State militia, and when the call for troops was received, April 15, 1861, he at once summoned the mustering of his brigade. Three days later, he set out for Annapolis, Md., at the head of the Eighth Massachusetts Regiment, and on May 16th was commissioned major-general and given command at Fortress Monroe. While there he declined to return fugitive slaves to their owners, declaring them, in his own original phrase, "contraband of war." In February, 1862, he was assigned to the command of the land forces of the New Orleans expedition, and after Admiral Farragut had passed the forts below the city, Butler took possession of New Orleans, remaining in command there until the 16th of December. During the remainder of the war he was active and vigorous in various commands of importance. In 1866, he entered Congress as a Republican representative, continuing there, save for the term of 1875-77, until 1879. He was a conspicuous figure in a score or more important congressional debates and took a prominent part in the impeachment of President Johnson. In 1871, he was defeated as a Republican candidate for governor of Massachusetts and suffered defeat also in 1878 and 1879 as the candidate of the Independent Greenback party. In 1882, he was, however, elected governor by the Democrats, but suffered defeat in the following year. In 1884, he was the candidate of the Greenback-Labor party for the Presidency. In 1892, he published his "Autobiography and Personal Reminiscences." Butler was a forceful military commander and an able lawyer, and possessed considerable gifts as a speaker and debater.

## CHARACTER AND RESULTS OF THE WAR

DELIVERED APRIL 2, 1863

M R. MAYOR,—With the profoundest gratitude for the too flattering commendation of my administration of the various trusts committed to me by the government, which, in behalf of your associates, you have

been pleased to tender, I ask you to receive my most heartfelt thanks. To the citizens of New York here assembled, graced by the fairest and loveliest, in kind appreciation of my services supposed to have been rendered to the country, I tender the deepest acknowledgments. I accept it all, not for myself, but for my brave comrades of the Army of the Gulf. I receive it as an earnest of your devotion to the country—an evidence of your loyalty to the constitution under which you live and under which you hope to die.

In order that the acts of the Army of the Gulf may be understood, perhaps it would be well, at a little length, with your permission, that some details should be given of the thesis upon which we fulfilled our duties. The first question, then, to be ascertained is, what is this contest in which the country is engaged? At the risk of being a little tedious, at the risk, even, of calling your attention to what might seem otherwise too elementary, I propose to run down through the history of the contest to see what it is that agitates the whole country at this day and this hour.

That we are in the midst of a civil commotion, all know. But what is that commotion? Is it a riot? Is it an insurrection? Is it a rebellion? Or is it a revolution? And pray, sir, although it may seem still more elementary, what is a riot? A riot, if I understand it, is simply an outburst of the passions of a number of men for the moment, in breach of the law, by force of numbers, to be put down and subdued by the civil authorities; if it goes further to be dealt with by the military authorities. But you say, sir, "Why treat us to a definition of a riot upon this occasion? Why, of all things, should you undertake to instruct a New York audience in what a riot is?"

To that I answer, because the administration of Mr.

Buchanan dealt with this great change of affairs as if it were a riot; because his government officer gave the opinion that in Charleston it was but a riot; and that, as there was no civil authority there to call out the military, therefore Sumter must be given over to the rioters, and such was the beginning of this struggle. Let us see how it grew up. I deal not now with causes but with effects—facts.

Directly after the guns of the rebels had turned upon Sumter, the several States of the South, in convention assembled, inaugurated a series of movements which took out from the Union divers States, and as each was attempted to be taken out, the riots, if such existed, were no longer found in them, but they became insurrectionary, and the administration, upon the 15th of April, 1861, dealt with this state of affairs as an insurrection and called out the militia of the United States to suppress an insurrection. I was called at that time into the service to administer the laws in putting down an insurrection.

I found a riot at Baltimore. The rioters had burned bridges; but the riot had hardly arisen to the dignity of an insurrection, because the State had not moved as an organized community. A few men were rioting at Baltimore; and as I marched into the State at the head of the United States troops, the question came up, what have I before me? You will remember that I offered then to put down all kinds of insurrections so long as the State of Maryland remained loyal to the United States. Transferred from thence to a wider sphere at Fortress Monroe, I found that the State of Virginia through its organization had taken itself out of the Union and was endeavoring to erect for itself an independent government, and I dealt with that State as being in rebellion and thought the property of the rebels of whatever name

or nature should be deemed rebellious property and contraband of war, subject to the laws of war.

I have been thus careful in stating these various steps, because, although through your kindness replying to eulogy, I am here answering every charge of inconsistency and wrong of intention for my acts done before the country. Wrong in judgment I may have been, but I insist wrong in intention or inconsistent with my former opinions never. Upon the same theory by which I felt myself bound to put down insurrection in Maryland, while it remained loyal, whether that insurrection was the work of blacks or whites—by the same loyalty to the constitution and laws I felt bound to confiscate slave property in the rebellious State of Virginia. Pardon me, sir, if right here I say that I am a little sensitive upon this topic.

I am an old-fashioned Andrew Jackson Democrat of twenty years' standing. And so far as I know I have never swerved, so help me God, from one of his teachings. Up to the time that disunion took place, I went as far as the farthest in sustaining the constitutional rights of the States. However bitter or distasteful to me were the obligations my fathers had made for me in the compromise of the constitution, it was not for me to pick out the sweet from the bitter, and, fellow Democrats, I took them all because they were constitutional obligations, and sustaining them all I stood by the South and by Southern rights under the constitution until I advanced so far as to look into the very pit of disunion into which they plunged, and then not liking the prospect I quietly withdrew.

And from that hour we went apart, how far apart you can judge when I tell you that on the 28th of December, 1860, I shook hands on terms of personal friendship with Jefferson

Davis, and on the 28th of December, 1862, you had the pleasure of reading his proclamation that I was to be hanged at sight.

And now, my friends, if you will allow me to pause for a moment in this line of thought, as we come up to the point of time when these men laid down their constitutional obligations, let me ask, what then were my rights and what were theirs? At that hour they repudiated the constitution of the United States by vote in solemn convention, and not only that, but they took arms in their hands and undertook by force to rend from the government what seemed to them the fairest portion of the heritage which my fathers had given to you and me as a rich legacy for our children. When they did that they abrogated, abnegated, and forfeited every constitutional right, and released me from every constitutional obligation so far as they were concerned.

Therefore when I was thus called upon to say what should be my action thereafter with regard to slavery, I was left to the natural instincts of my heart as prompted by a Christian education in New England, and I dealt with it accordingly. The same sense of duty to my constitutional obligations, and to the rights of the several States that required me, so long as those States remained under the constitution, to protect the system of slavery,—that same sense of duty after they had gone out from under the constitution, caused me to follow the dictates of my own untrammelled conscience.

So you see—and I speak now to my old Democratic friends that, however misjudging I may have been, we went along together, step by step, up to the point of disunion, and I claim that we ought still to go on in the same manner. We acknowledged the right of those men to hold slaves, because it was guaranteed to them by the compromise of our fathers

in the constitution, but if their State rights were to be respected, because of our allegiance to the constitution and our respect for State rights, when that sacred obligation was taken away by their own traitorous acts, and we, as well as the negroes, were disenthralled, why should not we follow the dictates of God's law and humanity?

By the exigencies of the public service removed once more to another sphere of action, at New Orleans, I found this problem coming up in another form, and that led me to examine and see how far had progressed this civil commotion now carried on by force of arms.

I believe, under our complex system of States, each having an independent government, with the United States covering all, that there can be treason to a State and not to the United States; revolution in a State and not as regards the United States; loyalty to a State and disloyalty to the Union; and loyalty to the Union and disloyalty to the organized government of a State. As an illustration, take the troubles which lately arose in the State of Rhode Island, where there was an attempt to rebel against the State government and to change the form of that government, but no rebellion against the United States. All of you are familiar with the movements of Mr. Dorr; in that matter there was no intent of disloyalty against the United States, but a great deal against the State government.

I therefore, in Louisiana, found a State government that had entirely changed its form and had revolutionized itself so far as it could; had created courts and imposed taxes, and put in motion all kinds of governmental machinery; and so far as her State government was concerned, Louisiana was no longer in and of itself one of the United States of America. It had, so far as depended on its own action, changed its State gov-

ernment and by solemn act forever seceded from the United States of America and attempted to join a new national government,—hostile to us, as one of the so-called Confederate States.

I found, I respectfully submit, a revolutionized State. There had been a revolution, by force; beyond a riot, which is an infraction of the law; beyond an insurrection, which is an abnegation of the law; beyond a rebellion, which is an attempt to override the law by force of numbers; a new State government formed that was being supported by force of arms.

Now, I asked myself, upon what thesis shall I deal with this people? Organized into a community under forms of law, they had seized a portion of the territory of the United States and were holding it by force of arms; and I respectfully submit I had to deal with them as alien enemies. They had forever passed the boundary of "wayward sisters" or "erring brothers," unless indeed they erred toward us as Cain did against his brother Abel. They had passed beyond brotherhood by treason added to murder. Aye, and Louisiana had done this in the strongest possible way, for she had seized on territory which the government of the United States had bought and paid for, and to which her people could advance no shadow of claim save as citizens of the United States. Therefore I dealt with them as alien enemies.

And what rights have alien enemies captured in war? They have the right, so long as they behave themselves and are non-combatants, to be free from personal violence; they have no other rights; and therefore it was my duty to see to it (and I believe the record will show I did see to it) that order was preserved and that every man who behaved well and did not aid the Confederate States was not molested in his person. I

held, by the laws of war, that everything else they had was at the mercy of the conqueror. They have claims to mercy and clemency; but no rights. Permit me to state the method in which their rights were defined by one gentleman of my staff. He very coolly paraphrased the Dred Scott decision and said they had no rights which a negro was bound to respect. But, dealing with them in this way, I took care to protect all men in personal safety.

Now, I hear a friend behind me say: "But how does your theory affect loyal men?" The difficulty in answering that proposition is this: In governmental action the government in making peace and carrying on war cannot deal with individuals, but with organized communities, whether organized wrongly or rightly; and all I could do, so far as my judgment taught me, for the individual loyal citizen, was to see to it that no exactation should be made of him and no property taken away from him that was not absolutely necessary for the success of military operations.

I know nothing else that I could do. I could not alter the carrying on of the war because loyal citizens were, unfortunately, like Dog Tray, found in bad company; to their persons, and to their property even, all possible protection I caused to be afforded. But let me repeat—for it is quite necessary to keep this in mind, and I am afraid that for want of so doing some of my old Democratic friends have got lost in going with one portion of the country rather than the other in their thoughts and feelings—let me repeat that, in making war or making peace, carrying on governmental operations of any sort, governments and their representatives, so far as I am instructed, can deal only with organized communities, and men must fall or rise with the communities in which they are situated.

You in New York must follow the government as expressed by the will of the majority of your State until you can revolutionize that government and change it; and those loyal at the South must, until this contest comes into process of settlement, also follow the action of the organized majorities in which their lot has been cast, and no man, no set of men, can see the possible solution of this or any other governmental problem as affecting States, except upon this basis.

Now, then, to pass from the particular to the general, to leave the detail in Louisiana, of which I have run down the account, rather as illustrating my meaning than otherwise, I come back to the question: What is now the nature of the contest with all the States that are banded together in the so-called Confederate States? Into what form has it come? It started in insurrection: it grew up a rebellion; it has become a revolution, and carries with it all the rights and incidents of a revolution.

Our government has dealt with it upon that ground. When the government blockaded Southern ports they dealt with it as a revolution; when they sent out cartels of exchange of prisoners they dealt with these people no longer as simple insurrectionists and traitors, but as organized revolutionists who had set up a government for themselves upon the territory of the United States.

Sir, let no man say to me, "Why then you acknowledge the right of revolution in these men!" I beg your pardon, sir; I only acknowledge the fact of revolution—that which has actually happened. I look these things in the face and I do not dodge them because they are unpleasant; I find this a revolution and these men are no longer, I repeat, our erring brethren, but they are our alien enemies, foreigners carrying on war against us, attempting to make alliances against us,

attempting surreptitiously to get into the family of nations. I agree that it is not a successful revolution and a revolution never to be successful,—pardon me, I was speaking theoretically, as a matter of law,—never to be successful until acknowledged by the parent State. Now, then, I am willing to unite with you in your cheers when you say a revolution, the rightfulness or success of which we, the parent State, never will acknowledge.

Why, sir, have I been so careful in bringing down with great particularity these distinctions? Because in my judgment there are certain logical consequences following from them as necessarily as various corollaries from a problem in Euclid. If we are at war, as I think, with a foreign country, to all intents and purposes, how can a man here stand up and say that he is on the side of that foreign country and not be an enemy to his country?

A man must be either for his country or against his country. He cannot, upon this theory, be throwing impediments all the time in the way of the progress of his government, under pretence that he is helping some other portion of his country. If any local man thinks that he must do something to bring back his erring brethren (if he likes that form of phrase) at the South, let him take his musket and go down and try it in that way. If he is still of a different opinion and thinks that is not the best way to bring them back, but he can do it by persuasion and talk, let him go down with me to Louisiana and I will set him over to Mississippi and if the rebels do not feel for his heart-strings, but not in love, I will bring him back. Let us say to him: “Choose ye this day whom ye will serve. If the Lord thy God be God, serve him; if Baal be God, serve ye him. But no man can serve two masters, God and Mammon.”

Again, there are other logical consequences to flow from the view which I have ventured to take of this subject, and one is as regards to our relations from past political action. If they are now alien enemies I am bound to them by no ties of party fealty or political affinity. They have passed out of that, and I think we ought to go back only to examine and see if all ties of party allegiance and party fealty as regards them are not broken, and satisfy ourselves that it is your duty and mine to look simply to our country and to its service, and leave them to look to the country they are attempting to erect, and to its service; and then let us try the conclusion with them, as we are doing by arms and the stern arbitrament of war.

Mark, by this I give up no territory of the United States. Every foot that was ever circumscribed on the map by the lines around the United States belongs to us. None the less because bad men have attempted to organize worse government upon various portions of it. It is to be drawn in under our laws and our government as soon as the power of the United States can be exerted for that purpose, and therefore, my friends, you see that next one of the logical consequences that proceed from our theory: that we have no occasion to carry on the fight for the constitution as it is.

Who is interfering with the constitution as it is? Who makes any attacks upon the constitution? We are fighting with those who have gone out and repudiated the constitution, and made another constitution for themselves. And now, my friends, I do not know but I shall speak some heresy, but as a Democrat, and as an Andrew Jackson Democrat, I am not for the Union as it was. I say, as a Democrat, as an Andrew Jackson Democrat, I am not for the Union to be again as it was. Understand me, I was for

the Union because I saw or thought I saw the troubles in the future which have burst upon us, but having undergone those troubles, having spent all this blood and this treasure I do not mean to go back again and be cheek by jowl with South Carolina as I was before, if I can help it.

Mark me, let no man misunderstand me, and I repeat, lest I may be misunderstood—there are none so slow to understand as those who do not want to—mark me, I say I do not mean to give up a single inch of the soil of South Carolina. If I had been in public life at that time and had had the position, the will, and the ability, I would have dealt with South Carolina as Jackson did and kept her in the Union at all hazards, but now she has gone out, and I will take care that when she comes in again she comes in better behaved, that she shall no longer be the firebrand of the Union—aye, and that she shall enjoy what her people never yet have enjoyed—the blessings of a republican form of government.

Therefore in that view I am not for the reconstruction of the Union as it was. I have spent treasure and blood enough upon it, in conjunction with my fellow citizens, to make it a little better. I think we can have a better Union the next time. It was good enough if it had been let alone. The old house was good enough for me, but as they have pulled down all the L-part, I propose, when we build it up, to build it up with all the modern improvements.

Another of the logical sequences, it seems to me, that follow in inexorable and not-to-be-shunned sequence upon this proposition, that we are dealing with alien enemies, is with regard to our duties as to the confiscation of rebel property, and that question would seem to me to be easy of settlement under the constitution and without any discussion, if my first proposition is right. Has it not been held

from the beginning of the world down to this day, from the time the Israelites took possession of the land of Canaan, which they got from alien enemies—and is it not the well-settled law of war to-day, that the whole property of alien enemies belonged to the conqueror, and that it is at his mercy and his clemency what should be done with it?

For one I would take it and give the loyal man who was loyal in his heart, at the South, enough to make him as well as he was before, and I would take the balance of it and distribute it among the volunteer soldiers who have gone—[The remainder of the sentence was drowned in a tremendous burst of applause]. And so far as I know them, if we should settle South Carolina with them, in the course of a few years I would be quite willing to receive her back into the Union.

This theory shows us how to deal with another proposition: What shall be done with the slaves? Here again the laws of war have long settled, with clearness and exactness, that it is for the conqueror, for the government which has maintained or extended its jurisdiction over conquered territory, to deal with slaves as it pleases, to free them or not as it chooses. It is not for the conquered to make terms, or to send their friends into the conquering country to make terms for them. Another corollary follows from the proposition that we are fighting with alien enemies, which relieves us from a difficulty which seems to trouble some of my old Democratic friends, and that is in relation to the question of arming the negro slaves.

If the seceded States are alien enemies, is there any objection that you know of, and if so, state it, to our arming one portion of the foreign country against the other while they are fighting us? Suppose that we were at war with England.

Who would get up here in New York and say that we must not arm the Irish, lest they should hurt some of the English? And yet at one time, not very far gone, all those Englishmen were our grandfathers' brothers. Either they or we erred, but we are now separate nations. There can be no objection, for another reason, because there is no law of war or of nations,—no rule of governmental action that I know of, which prevents a country from arming any portion of its citizens; and if the slaves do not take part in the rebellion, they become simply our citizens residing in our territory which is at present usurped by our enemies to be used in its defence as other citizens are. At this waning hour I do not propose to discuss but merely a hint at these various subjects.

There is one question I am frequently asked, and most frequently by my old Democratic friends: "General Butler, what is your experience? Will the negroes fight?"

To that I answer, I have no personal experience, because I left the Department of the Gulf before they were fairly brought into action. But they did fight under Jackson at Chalmette. More than that; let Napoleon III answer, who has hired them to do what the veterans of the Crimea cannot do—to whip the Mexicans. Let the veterans of Napoleon I, under Le Clerc, who were whipped by them out of San Domingo, say whether they will fight or not.

What has been the demoralizing effect upon them as a race by their contact with white men I know not, but I cannot forget that their fathers would not have been slaves, but that they were captives of war in their own country in hand-to-hand fights among the several chiefs. They would fight at some time, and if you want to know any more than that I can only advise you to try them.

Passing to another logical deduction from the principle that we are carrying on war against alien enemies (for I pray you to remember that I am only carrying out the same idea upon which the government acted when it instituted the blockade), I meet the question whether we thereby give foreign nations any greater rights than if we considered them as a rebellious portion of our country. We have heretofore seemed to consider that if we acknowledged that this was a revolution, and the rebels were alien enemies in this fight, that therefore we should give to foreign nations greater apparent right to interfere in our affairs than they would have if the insurgents were considered and held by us as rebels only, in a rebellious part of our own country.

The first answer to that is this: that so far as the rebels are concerned, they are estopped to deny that they are exactly what they claim themselves to be, alien enemies; and so far as foreign nations are concerned, while the rebels are alien to us yet they are upon our territory, and until we acknowledge them there is no better settled rule of the law of nations than that the recognition of them as an independent nation is an act of war. They have no right to recognize them, because we say to them, "We will deal with you as belligerent alien enemies," than they would have to treat with them if we hold them simply as rebels; and no country is more sternly and strongly bound by that view than is England, because she claimed the recognition by France of our independence to be an act of war and declared war accordingly.

Therefore I do not see why we lose any rights. We do not admit that this is a rightful rebellion—we do not recognize it as such—we do not act toward it except in the best way we can to put it down and to re-revolutionize the country.

What is the duty then of neutrals if these are alien enemies? We thus find them a people with whom no neutral nation has any treaty of amity or alliance: they are strangers to every neutral nation. For example let us take the English. The English nation have no treaty with the rebels—have no relations with the rebels—open relations I mean, none that are recognized by the laws of nations. They have a treaty of amity, friendship, and commerce with us, and now what is their duty in the contest between us and our enemies to whom they are strangers? They claim it to be neutrality, only such neutrality as they should maintain between two friendly nations with each of whom they have treaties of amity. Let me illustrate: I have two friends that have got into a quarrel—into a fight if you please; I am on equally good terms with both and I do not choose to take a part with either. I treat them as belligerents and hold myself neutral. That is the position of a nation where two equally friendly nations are fighting.

But again I have a friend who is fighting with a stranger, with whom I have nothing to do, of whom I know nothing that is good, of whom I have seen nothing except that he would fight—what is my duty to my friend in that case? To stand perfectly neutral? It is not the part of a friend so to do between men and it is not the part of a friendly nation as between nations. And yet from some strange misconception our English friends profess to do no more than to stand perfectly neutral while they have treaties of amity and commerce with us and no treaty which they acknowledge with the South.

And therefore I say there is a much higher duty on the part of foreign nations toward us when we are in contest with a people with which they have no treaty of amity than there

possibly can be toward them. To illustrate how this fact bears upon this question: the English say, "Oh! we are going to be neutral; we will not sell you any arms, because to be neutral strictly we should have to sell the same to the Confederates."

To that I answer: You have treaties of amity and commerce with us by which you have agreed to trade with us. You have no treaty of amity and commerce with them by which you agree to trade with them. Why not then trade with us? Why not give us that rightful preference except for reasons of hostility to us that I will state hereafter? I have been thus particular upon this, because in stating my proposition to gentlemen in whose judgment I have great confidence they have said to me, "I agree with your theory, Mr. Butler, but I am afraid you will involve us with other nations by the view that you take of that matter."

But I insist, and I can only state the proposition for want of time—your own minds will carry it out particularly—I insist that there is a higher and closer duty to us—treating the rebels as a strange nation not yet admitted into the family of nations—that there is a higher duty from our old friendship on her part, from our old relations toward Great Britain, than there is to this rebellious, pushing, attempting-to-get-into-place member of the family of nations.

There is still another logical sequence which in my judgment follows from this view of the case. The great question put to me by my friends and the great question which is now agitating this country is, How are we to get these men back? How are we to get this territory back? How are we to reconstruct the nation? I think it is much better answered upon this hypothesis than any other. There are but two ways in which this contest can be ended; one is by re-revolu-

tionizing a portion of this seceding territory and have the people ask to be admitted into the Union; another is, to bring it all back so that if they do not come back in the first way they shall come back bound to our triumphal car of victory. Now when any portion of the South becomes loyal to the North and to the Union, or to express it with more care when any portion of the inhabitants of the South wish to become again a part of the nation and will throw off the government of Jefferson Davis, erect themselves into a State, and come and ask us to take them back with such a State constitution as they ought to be admitted under, there is no difficulty in its being done. There is no witchery about this. This precise thing has been done in the case of Western Virginia. She went out—stayed out for a while.

By the aid of our armies and by the efforts of her citizens she re-revolutionized, threw off the government of the rest of the State of Virginia; threw off the Confederate yoke; erected herself into a State with a constitution such as I believe is quite satisfactory to all of us, especially the amendment. She has asked to come back and has been received back and is the first entering wedge of that series of States who will come back that way.

But suppose they will not come back?

We are bound to subjugate them. What then do they become? Territories of the United States—acquired by force of arms—precisely as we acquired California, precisely as we acquired Nevada, precisely as we acquired—not exactly though—as we acquired Texas—and then is there any difficulty in treating with these men? Was there any difficulty in dealing with the State of California when our men went there and settled in sufficient numbers so as to give that State the benefits of the blessings of a republican form of govern-

ment? Was there any difficulty in obtaining her beyond our transactions with Mexico?

None whatever. Will there be any difficulty in taking to ourselves the new State of Nevada when she is ready to come and ripe to come? Was there any difficulty in taking into the Union any portion of the Louisiana purchase when we bought it first? Will there be any difficulty when her people get ready to come back to the United States of our taking her back again more than perhaps to carry out the parallel a little further, to pay a large sum of money besides, as we did in the case of California after we conquered it from Mexico? These States having gone out without cause, without right, without grievance, and having formed themselves into new States and taken upon themselves new alliances, I am not for having them come back without readmission.

I feel, perhaps, if the ladies will pardon the illustration, like a husband whose wife has run away with another man, and has divorced herself from him; he will not take her to his arms until they have come before the priest and been remarried. I have, I say, the same feeling in the case of these people that have gone out; when they repent and ask to come back I am ready to receive them, and I am not ready until then.

And now, having gone by far too discursively over many of these points which I desired to bring to your attention, let us return to what has been done in the Department of the Gulf, to which you have so flatteringly alluded, and to which I will answer. While I am very much gratified at the kind expression of your regard, whether that expression is justified can be told in a single word. When I left the Department of the Gulf, I sat down and deliberately put in the form

of an address to the people of that Department, the exact acts I had done while in their Department; I said to them, "I have done these things." I have now waited more than three months, and I have yet to hear a denial from that Department that the things therein stated were done.

And to that alone, sir, I can point as a justification of your too flattering eulogy, and to that I point forever as my answer to every slander and every calumny. The ladies of New Orleans knew whether they were safe; has any one of them ever said she was not? The men of New Orleans knew whether life and property were safe; has any man ever said they were not? The poor of New Orleans knew whether the money which was taken from the rich rebels was applied to the alleviation of their wants; has any man denied that it was? To that record I point—and it will be the only answer that I shall ever make; and I only do it now because I desire that you shall have neither doubt nor feeling upon this subject—it is the only answer I can ever make to the thousand calumnies that have been poured upon me and mine, and upon the officers who worked with me for the good of our country.

I desire now to say a single word upon the question, what are the prospects of this war? My simple opinion would be no better than that of another man; but let me show you the reason for the faith that is in me that this war is progressing steadily to a successful termination. Compare the state of the country on January 1, 1863, with the state of the country on January 1, 1862, and tell me whether there has not been progress. At that time the Union armies held no considerable portion of Missouri, of Kentucky, or of Tennessee; none of Virginia, except Fortress Monroe and Arlington Heights; none of North Carolina save Hatteras, and

none of South Carolina save Port Royal. All the rest was ground of struggle at least, and all the rest furnishing supplies to the rebels.

Now they hold none of Missouri, none of Kentucky, none of Tennessee, for any valuable purpose of supplies, because the western portion is in our hands, and the eastern portion has been so run over by the contending armies that the supplies are gone. They hold no portion of Virginia valuable for supplies, for that is eaten out by their armies. We hold one third of Virginia and half of North Carolina. We hold our own in South Carolina, and I hope that before the eleventh of this month we shall hold a little more. We hold two thirds of Louisiana in wealth and population. We hold all Arkansas and all Texas so far as supplies are concerned, so long as Farragut is between Port Hudson and Vicksburg. And I believe the colored troops held Florida at the last accounts.

Now, then, let us see to what the rebellion is reduced. It is reduced to the remainder of Virginia, part of North and South Carolina, all of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, and a small portion of Louisiana and Tennessee; Texas and Arkansas, as I said before, being cut off. Why I draw strong hopes from this is, that their supplies come either from Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, or Texas, and these are now completely beyond their reach. To this fact I look largely for the suppression of this rebellion and the overthrow of this revolution.

They have got to the end of their conscription; we have not begun ours. They have got to the end of their national credit; we have not put ours in any market in the world. And why should any man be desponding? Why should any man say that this great work has gone on too slowly? Why

should men feel impatient? The war of the Revolution was seven years. Why should men be so anxious that nations should march faster than they are prepared to march—faster than the tread of nations has ever been in the Providence of God? Nations in war have ever moved slowly. We are too impatient—we never learn anything, it would seem to me, from reading history—I speak of myself as well as you—I have shared in that impatience myself. I have shared in your various matters of disappointment.

I was saying but the other day to a friend of mine, “It seems strange to me that our navy cannot catch that steamer ‘Alabama,’ there must be something wrong in the Navy Department, I am afraid,” and I got quite impatient. I had hardly got over the wound inflicted by the capture of the “Jacob Bell,” when came the piracies of the “Golden Eagle,” and the “Olive Jane,” and as one was from Boston, it touched me keenly.

He replied: “Don’t be impatient; remember that Paul Jones, with a sailing-ship on the coast of England, put the whole British navy at defiance for many months, and wandered up and down that coast, and worked his will upon it, and England had no naval power to contend with, and had not twenty-five hundred miles of sea coast to blockade as we have.”

I remember that in the French war, Lord Cochrane, with one vessel, and that was by no means a steamship, held the whole French coast in terror against the French navy. And so it has been done by other nations. Let us have a little patience, and possess our souls with a little patriotism and less politics, and we shall have no difficulty.

But there is one circumstance of this war, I am bound to say in all frankness to you, that I do not like the appearance

of, and that is because we cannot exactly reach it. I refer to the war made upon our commerce, which is not the fault of the navy, nor of any department of the government, but is the fault of our allies. Pardon me a moment, for I am speaking now in the commercial city of New York, where I think it is of interest to you, and of a matter to which I have given some reflection—pardon me a moment, while we examine and see what England has done. She agreed to be neutral—I have tried to demonstrate to you that she ought to have been a little more than neutral—but has she been even that? [“No, no, no.”] Let us see the evidences of that “No.”

In the first place there has been nothing of the Union cause that her orators and her statesmen have not maligned; there has been nothing of sympathy or encouragement which she has not afforded our enemies; there has been nothing which she could do under the cover of neutrality which she has not done to aid them. Nassau has been a naval arsenal for pirate rebel boats to refit in. Kingston has been their coal depot, and Barbadoes has been the dancing hall to fête pirate chieftains in.

What cause, my friends; what cause, my countrymen, has England so to deal with us? What is the reason she does so deal with us? Is it because we have never shown sympathy toward her or love to her people? And mark me here, that I make a distinction between the English people as a mass and the English government. I think the heart of her people beats responsive to ours—but I know her government and aristocracy hate us with a hate which passeth all understanding. I say, let us see if we have given any cause for this. I know, I think, what the cause is; but let us see what we have done.

You remember that when the famine overtook the Irish in 1847, the "Macedonian" frigate carried out the bread from this country to feed the poor that England was starving. When afterward the heir to her throne arrived here, aye, in this very house, our people assembled to do him welcome in such numbers that the very floor would not uphold them, and to testify our appreciation of the high qualities of his mother and sovereign, and our love of the English people—we gave him such a reception as Northern gentlemen give to their friends, and his present admirers at Richmond gave him such a reception as Southern gentlemen give to their friends. What further has been done by us? No, I have no right to claim any portion of it. What has been done by the merchants of New York? The "George Griswold" goes out to feed the starving poor of Lancashire, to which yourselves all contributed, and it was only God's blessing on that charity that prevented that vessel being overhauled and burned by the "Alabama," fitted out from an English port.

And to-day at Birkenhead the "Sumter" is being fitted out—at Barbadoes the captain of the "Florida" is being feted—and somewhere the "290," the cabalistic number of the British merchants who contributed to her construction, is preying upon our commerce, while we hear that at Glasgow a steamer is being built for the Emperor of China, and at Liverpool another is about to be launched for the Emperor of China. Pardon me, I don't believe the Emperor of China will buy many ships of Great Britain until they bring back the silk gowns they stole out of his palace at Pekin. And even now, I say that our commerce is being preyed upon by ships in the hands of the rebels built by English builders. And I ask the merchants of the city of New York whether

has not already reached the point where our commerce, to be safe, has to be carried in British bottoms.

Now I learn from the late correspondence of Earl Russell with the rebel commissioner Mason, that the British have put two articles of the treaty of Paris in compact with the rebels: First, that enemies' goods shall be covered by neutral flags, and there shall be free trade at the ports and open trade with neutrals. Why didn't Great Britain put the other part of the treaty in compact; namely, that there should be no more privateering, if she was honest and earnest, and did not mean our commerce should be crippled by rebel piracy?

Again, when we took from her deck our two senators and rebel ambassadors, Slidell and Mason, and took them, in my judgment, according to the laws of nations, what did she do but threaten us with war? I agree that it was wisely done, perhaps, not to provoke war at that time—we were not quite in a condition for it—but I thank God, and that always, that we are fast getting in a condition to remember that threat always and every day! Why is it all this has been done? Because we alone can be the commercial rivals of Great Britain! and because the South has no commercial marine.

There has been in my judgment a deliberate attempt on the part of Great Britain, under the plea of neutrality, to allow our commerce to be ruined for her own benefit, if human actions indicate human thoughts. It is idle to tell me Great Britain does not know these vessels are fitted out in her ports. It is idle and insulting to tell me that she put the "Alabama" under \$20,000 bonds not to go into the service of the Confederate States. The "Jacob Bell" alone would pay the amount of the bond over and over again.

We did not so deal with her when she was at war with Russia. On the suggestion of the British minister our gov-

ernment stopped, with the rapidity of lightning, the sailing of a steamer supposed to be for Russia, until the minister himself was convinced of her good faith and willing to let her go. We must take some means to put a stop to these piracies and to the fitting out of pirate vessels in English ports. They are always telling us about the inefficiency of a republican government, but as they are acting now, we could stop two pirates to their one. We must in some way put a stop to the construction and fitting out of these pirate vessels in English ports to prey upon our commerce or else consent to keep our ships idle at home. We must stop them—we must act upon the people of England if we cannot secure a stoppage in any other way.

I have seen it stated that the loss to our commerce already amounts to \$9,000,000—enough to have paid the expense of keeping a large number of vessels at home and out of the way of these cruisers.

What shall we do in the matter? Why, when our government takes a step toward putting a stop to it (and I believe it is taking that step now, but it is not in my province to speak of it) we must aid it in so doing. We, the people, are the government in this matter, and when our government gets ready to take a step we must get ready to sustain it.

England told us what to do when we took Mason and Slidell, and she thought there was a likelihood to be war. She stopped exportation of those articles which she thought we wanted, and which she had allowed to be exported before. Let us do the same thing.

Let us proclaim non-intercourse, so that no ounce of American food shall ever by any accident get into an Englishman's mouth until these piracies cease. [A voice: "Say that again!"] I never say anything, my friends, that I am afraid

to say again. I repeat—let us proclaim non-intercourse, so that no ounce of American food shall by any accident get into an Englishman's mouth until these piracies are stopped. That we have a right to do; and when we ever do do it, my word for it, the English government will find out where these vessels are going to, and they will write to the Emperor of China upon the subject. But I hear some objectors say, "If you proclaim non-intercourse England may go to war."

Now I am not to be frightened twice running. I got frightened a little better than a year ago, but I have gotten over it. Further, this is a necessity; for we must keep our ships at home in some form to save them from these piracies when a dozen of these privateers get loose upon the seas. It will become a war measure which any nation, under any law, under any construction, would warrant our right to enforce.

And this course should be adopted toward the English nation alone, for I have never heard of any blockade runners under the French flag, nor under the Russian flag, nor under the Austrian flag, nor under the Greek flag. No! not even the Turks will do it. Therefore I have ventured to suggest the adoption of this course for your consideration as a possible,—aye, not only possible, but, unless this state of things has a remedy, a probable event; for we must see to it that we protect ourselves and take a manly place among the nations of the earth. But I hear some friend of mine say, "I am afraid your scheme would bring down our provisions; and if we do not export them to England we shall find our Western markets still more depressed." Allow me, with great deference to your judgment, gentlemen, to suggest a remedy for that at the same time.

I would suggest that the exportation of gold be prohibited and then there would be nothing to forward to meet the bills

of exchange and pay for the goods we have bought, except our provisions. And, taking a hint from one of your best and most successful merchants, we could pay for our silks and satins in butter, and lard, and corn, and beef, and pork, and bring up the prices in the West, so that they could afford to pay the increased tariff in bringing them forward, now rendered necessary, I suppose, upon your railroads. And if our fair sisters and daughters will dress in silks, and satins, and laces, they will not feel any more troubled that a portion of the price goes to the Western farmer to enhance his gains instead of going into the coffers of a Jew banker in Wall street.

You will observe, my friends, that in the list of grievances with which I charge England, I have not charged her with tampering with our leading politicians. So far as any evidence I have, I don't know that she is guilty; but what shall we say of our leading politicians that have tampered with her? I have read of it in the letters of Lord Lyons with much surprise—with more surprise than has been excited in me by any other fact of this war—I had, somehow, got an inkling of the various things that came up in previous instances, so I was not very much surprised at them; but when I so read a statement, deliberately put forward, that here in New York leading politicians had consulted with the British minister as to how these United States could be separated and broken up, every drop of blood in my veins boiled; and I would have liked to have met that leading politician. I do not know that Lord Lyons is to blame. I suppose, sir, if a man comes to one of your clerks and offers to go into partnership with him to rob your neighbor's bank, and he reports him to you, you do not blame the clerk; but what do you do with the man who makes the offer?

I think we had better take a lesson from the action of Washington's administration—when the French minister, M. Genet, undertook even to address the people of the United States by letter, complaint was made to his government and he was recalled, and a law was passed preventing for all future time any interference by foreign diplomatists with the people of the United States.

I want to be understood,—I have no evidence of any interference on the part of Lord Lyons; but he says in his letter to Earl Russell that, both before and after a certain event, leading politicians came to him and desired that he would do what—(I am giving the substance and not words)—desired that he would request his government not to interfere between the North and South. Why? Because it would aid the country not to interfere? No! Because, if England did interfere the country would spurn the interference and be stronger than ever to crush the rebellion.

Mark again the insidious way in which the point was put. They knew how we felt because of the action of England; they knew that the heart of this people beat true to the constitution and that it could not brook any interference on the part of England. What, then, did these politicians do? They asked the British minister to use the influence of British diplomacy to induce other nations to interfere, but to take care that Great Britain should keep out of sight, lest we should see the cat under the meal. This is precisely the proposition that they made. You observe that in speaking of these men I have up to this moment used the word politicians. What kind of politicians? They cannot be Democratic politicians.

How I should like to hear Andrew Jackson say a few words upon such politicians who call themselves Democrats! ["He

would hang them."] No, I don't think he would have an opportunity to do so; he never would be able to catch them. I have felt it my duty here in the city of New York, because of the interest I have in public affairs, to call attention to this most extraordinary fact—that there are men in the community so lost to patriotism, so bound up in the traditions of party, so selfish, as to be willing to tamper with Great Britain in order to bring about the separation of this country.

It is the most alarming fact that I have yet seen. I had rather see a hundred thousand men set in the field on the rebel side—aye, I had rather see Great Britain armed against us openly, as she is covertly—than to be forced to believe that there are amongst us such men as these, lineal descendants of Judas Iscariot, intermarried with the race of Benedict Arnold.

It has shown me a great danger with which we are threatened, and I call upon all true men to sustain the government—to be loyal to the government. As you, sir, were pleased to say, the present government was not the government of my choice, I did not vote for it or for any part of it; but it is the government of my country, it is the only organ by which I can exert the force of the country to protect its integrity; and so long as I believe that government to be honestly administered I will throw a mantle over any mistakes that I may think it has made and support it heartily, with hand and purse, so help me God!

I have no loyalty to any man or men; my loyalty is to the government; and it makes no difference to me who the people have chosen to administer the government as long as the choice has been constitutionally made and the persons so chosen hold their places and powers. I am a traitor and a false man if I falter in my support. This is what I under-

stand to be loyalty to a government; and I was sorry to learn, as I did the other day, that there was a man in New York who professed not to know the meaning of the word loyalty. I desire to say here that it is the duty of every man to be loyal to the government, to sustain it, to pardon its errors and help to rectify them, and to do all he can to aid it in carrying the country on in the course of glory and grandeur in which it was started by our fathers.

Let me say to you, my friends—to you, young men, that no man who opposed his country in time of war ever prospered. The Tory of the Revolution, the Hartford Conventionist of 1812, the immortal seven who voted against the supplies for the Mexican War—all history is against these men. Let no politician of our day put himself in the way of the march of this country to glory and greatness, for whoever does so will surely be crushed. The course of our nation is onward and let him who opposes it beware.

“ The mower mows on—though the adder may writhe,  
Or the copperhead coil round the blade of his scythe.”

It only remains, sir, for me to repeat the expression of my gratitude to you and the citizens of New York here assembled for the kindness with which you and they have received me and listened to me, for which please again accept my thanks.

# GOVERNOR ANDREW



JOHN ALBION ANDREW, American statesman, Republican Governor of Massachusetts (1861-66), and orator, was born at Windham, Me., May 31, 1818, and died at Boston, Oct. 30, 1867. He was educated at Bowdoin College, and after studying law was admitted to the Bar in 1840, and for twenty years practiced his profession at Boston. He took a lively interest in politics, often making political addresses in support of the Whig party, to which he then belonged; and his action as counsel in several fugitive slave cases brought him into prominence as a vigorous opponent of slavery. In 1858, he was elected to the State senate, and in 1860 was chosen Republican governor of Massachusetts and became one of the most active of the "War Governors." He promptly seconded the war measures of Lincoln's administration, and in a week after the President had called for troops (April 15, 1861), Governor Andrew had dispatched five regiments to Washington. He was four times reelected to the governorship, holding the office until January, 1866, when he declined further nomination. During the Civil War he delivered many eloquent and patriotic addresses. He was a man of much executive ability and stainless integrity; as an orator he was both forcible and eloquent. He was a prominent and useful member of the Unitarian body, and, in 1865, presided over the first national Unitarian Convention. Several memoirs of Governor Andrew have appeared.

## THE EVE OF WAR

FROM ADDRESS TO THE LEGISLATURE OF MASSACHUSETTS, JANUARY 5, 1861

THE constitutional choice to the presidency of a citizen who adheres to the original principles of the fathers of the country, is the happy result of the recent national election. But by events which have since transpired in the southern States it appears that a large, influential, and energetic body of men in that section of the country, who control the action of at least the State of South Carolina, desire to resist, if necessary, by force of arms, this peaceful and constitutional triumph of republican principles, to which they ought in honor and loyalty to yield a generous acquiescence.

Forgetful of the traditions of their ancestors they seem determined to live in peace under no government which shall not concede to them the privilege not only of enslaving their fellow beings within their own dominion, but also of transporting them at their pleasure into the national territory, or from State to State absolutely without restriction, and of retaining them as slaves wheresoever within the national limits they themselves may please to sojourn.

It is the recommendation of President Buchanan in his recent annual message, that by means of constitutional amendments to be initiated by Congress or in a national convention, concessions shall be made for the satisfaction of this extraordinary demand. This is a subject which I commend to your immediate but deliberate consideration, and I shall be happy to concur with what I hope will be the unanimous sentiment of the legislature, in a declaration of the opinion of Massachusetts with reference to the state of the Union and the suggestions of the federal Executive.

If Massachusetts, either by voice or vote, can properly do anything to avert from those misguided men the miserable consequences which threaten to succeed their violent action —the pecuniary disturbances and the civil commotions which must necessarily occur within their own borders if they persist in their career, her voice and vote should not be withheld. Not the least deplorable result of the action of South Carolina I apprehend will be the insecurity to life and property which will result throughout the whole South from fear of servile insurrection. Wherever slavery exists, we have the authority of Jefferson for believing that, in his own words, “the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time; it will come; and whether brought on by the gen-

erous energy of our own minds, or by the bloody process of St. Domingo, is a leaf of our history not turned over."

The enslaved negro population of the South is not destitute of intelligence nor devoid of that sentiment of resistance to tyranny which naturally inspires the oppressed to seek for freedom. If as appears probable it shall once conceive from the present march of events that it has no hope of emancipation from any generous exertion of the minds of its masters a resort to that process will be only the logical impulse of human nature. That God may be pleased to overrule the folly of man so as to avert so dreadful a calamity must be the prayer of every American; but in my judgment it lies at the end of the road which South Carolina invites her sister States upon the Gulf of Mexico to enter.

I have searched the position of Massachusetts with all the disinterested patriotism which I could command for the performance of that duty, and I find nothing by which I can reproach her with responsibility for such results if they shall come to pass; but I invite you to a similar examination.

The truth of history compels me to declare that one chief source of the difficulty which we are called to encounter lies in the incessant misrepresentation of the principles, purposes, and methods of the people who compose the majority in the free States by superserviceable individuals, who undertake to monopolize friendship for the people of the slaveholding States; and candor requires me to add that they profess a friendship the largest part of which might be analyzed into dislike of their political opponents.

I have for twenty years past been a constant and careful observer of public men and affairs; and for twelve years, at least, I have been intimately aware of the private as well as the public declarations and conduct of the representative

men in almost every town and village of the Commonwealth. I think I may claim also some intimacy with the great body of the people of Massachusetts of whatsoever party. This period has been one of extraordinary and intense political interest. The tenderest sentiments, the deepest convictions, the warmest emotions have all been stirred by the course of public affairs. Bitter disappointments, the keenest sense of injustice, the consciousness of subjection to most flagrant wrong have fallen to the lot of our people.

The Fugitive Slave Bill of 1850 with its merciless severity and the ostentatious indignity with which it was executed; the repeal of the Missouri restriction upon the extension of slavery over national territory; the violent means adopted to prevent emigrants from this Commonwealth from participating in the settlement of Kansas; the invasion of that Territory by men armed with the plunder from national arsenals; the imposition of fraudulent legislatures upon a people temporarily subjugated by ruffianism and unprotected by a federal executive which also forbade them to protect themselves; the indiscriminate pillage, fire, and slaughter to which peaceable settlers were subjected without cause or excuse; the repeated exertions of the national administration in conspiracy with the enemies of freedom and good government, to impose and enforce upon Kansas a constitution sanctioning slavery; the attempt to withdraw the discussion of political questions from the people themselves and to confine it to a conclave of judges; the assault upon free speech in Congress by a murderous attack upon a senator in his seat for opinions expressed in debate and for the manner of their expression; the indifference of positive approval with which this attempt to overthrow representative institutions was treated throughout a large portion of the country; the pros-

titution of all the powers of the government and the bending of all its energy to propagate a certain interest for the benefit of a few speculators in lands, negroes, and politics, and to discourage the free labor of the toiling masses of the people; the menaces of violence and war against the constitution and the Union with which our arguments and our constitutional resistance have been met; these all are but a part of the record of the last ten years of American political history, which is burned into the memory of the people of Massachusetts.

And yet during all the excitement of this period, inflamed by the heats of repeated presidential elections, I have never known a single Massachusetts Republican to abandon his loyalty, surrender his faith, or seal up his heart against the good hopes and kind affections which every devoted citizen ought to entertain for every section of his country. During all this maladministration of the national government, the people of Massachusetts have never wavered from their faith in its principles or their loyalty to its organization.

Looking forward to the long ages of the future; building always, in their own minds, for countless generations yet to come; they have endured, and are willing still cheerfully and hopefully to endure, much wrong and more misconception, because they trust in the blood inherited from heroic ancestors; in the principles of constitutional liberty; in the theory of democratic institutions; in the honest purpose of the intelligent masses of the people everywhere; in the capacity of truth and right ultimately to reach and control the minds of men; in an undying affection for their whole country, its memories, traditions, and hopes; and above all in the good Providence of God.

It was at a great cost that our fathers established their in-

dependence and erected this Union of States—which exists under the form of a national government, unquestionable as to its authority to act on all persons and all things within the sphere of its jurisdiction and the range of its granted powers. It needs ask permission from no one to fulfil its functions or to perpetuate its existence. It has no right nor power to abdicate; nor to expel a State, or any portion of the people of any State, from the benefits of its protection; nor to permit their revolt against the duties of a common citizenship.

By the incurring of national debts, by the granting of pensions, patents, and copyrights, by the issue of commissions establishing a tenure of office not terminable at the pleasure of the appointing power, by the purchase and the conquest of territory erected into additional States, by the improvement of harbors and rivers and the construction of military roads, by the settlement of wildernesses and the development of their resources under the national patronage, by the investment of vast sums of money in buildings for the transaction of public business, in light-houses, navy-yards, fortifications, vessels of war, and their equipment, by the assumption of obligations under treaties with Indian tribes and foreign powers, the people of the United States have paid and are paying a continuing consideration for the existence of this national government in all its sovereign territorial integrity.

All the people of all the States are interlocked and interlaced in a vast web of mutual interests, rights, and obligations as various and as precious as are the characteristics of that wonderful civilization in which they participate. And this Union, through whatever throes or crises it may pass, cannot expire except with the annihilation of the people.

Come what may I believe that Massachusetts will do her duty. She will stand by the incoming national administration as she has stood by the past ones; because her people will forever stand by their country. The records of her revolutionary history declare her capacity and her will to expend money, sympathy, and men to sustain the common cause. More than half the soldiers of the Revolution were furnished by New England; and Massachusetts alone contributed more men to the federal armies than were enlisted in all the southern States. She is willing to make the same sacrifices again if need be in the same cause; and her capacity to do so has increased in proportion with the increase in her wealth and population.

The echoes of the thunder of her revolutionary battle-fields have not yet died away upon the ears of her sons, and the vows and prayers of her early patriots still whisper their inspiration. The people of Massachusetts will in any event abide by her plighted faith. She agreed to the constitution of the United States. It is the charter of the Union, it is the record of the contract, and the written evidence of rights intended to be secured to the States and to the people.

History shows that never at any one time is there more than one grand issue on trial under a popular government before the great tribunal of the people. A reactionary movement against the doctrines and traditions of liberty handed down from the beginning precipitated the trial in the elections of 1856 of an issue made up upon the relation of slavery to the territorial possessions of the nation, and the right of the people to manage those possessions so as to protect themselves, preserve their liberties, strengthen the Union, promote the common happiness and welfare, and best

develop the resources of the lands within exclusive federal jurisdiction.

By the conduct and manifest designs of the leaders of that same reactionary movement the same issue was kept open and presented to the country in a form still more intense, and a popular verdict demanded in the elections of 1860. So far as that issue can be settled by a popular election of President of the United States, its settlement is for the present complete. In the next national election it may again be presented and the grand issue of 1860 be repeated in 1864, should the people of the country be of opinion that any duty or practical advantage remains dependent on the possible result of a new trial. Meanwhile other duties command our immediate care. There is now no issue before the people touching their political relations to slavery in the Territories. The policy of the national government in that regard is determined for the next four years; but instead of preparing for a rehearing and an endeavor to reverse the verdict at the end of that period, that party of reaction has now engaged in an effort to abolish the tribunal and overthrow the authority of the people themselves. And the single question now presented to the nation is this: "Shall a reactionary spirit, unfriendly to liberty, be permitted to subvert democratic republican government organized under constitutional forms?"

Upon this issue, over the heads of all mere politicians and partisans, in behalf of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts I appeal directly to the warm hearts and clear heads of the great masses of the people. The men who own and till the soil, who drive the mills, and hammer out their own iron and leather on their own anvils and lapstones, and they who, whether in the city or the country, reap the rewards of enter-

prising industry and skill in the varied pursuits of business, are honest, intelligent, patriotic, independent, and brave. They know that simple defeat in an election is no cause for the disruption of a government. They know that those who declare that they will not live peaceably within the Union do not mean to live peaceably out of it. They know that the people of all sections have a right which they intend to maintain, of free access from the interior to both oceans, and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, and of the free use of all the lakes and rivers and highways of commerce, north, south, east, or west. They know that the Union means peace and unfettered commercial intercourse from sea to sea and from shore to shore; that it secures us all against the unfriendly presence or possible dictation of any foreign power, and commands respect for our flag and security for our trade.

And they do not intend, nor will they ever consent to be excluded from these rights which they have so long enjoyed, nor to abandon the prospect of the benefits which humanity claims for itself by means of their continued enjoyment in the future. Neither will they consent that the continent shall be overrun by the victims of a remorseless cupidity, and the elements of civil danger increased by the barbarizing influences which accompany the African slave trade.

Inspired by the same ideas and emotions which commanded the fraternization of Jackson and Webster on another great occasion of public danger, the people of Massachusetts, confiding in the patriotism of their brethren in other States, accept this issue and respond in the words of Jackson: "The Federal Union, it must be preserved!"

## IN HONOR OF PATRIOT HEROES

AT COMMEMORATION EXERCISES HELD IN CAMBRIDGE,  
JULY 21, 1865

**M**R. PRESIDENT,—Not an alumnus or scholar of Harvard College, I could hardly persuade myself of the propriety of my position upon the platform to-day; and yet the relation which I have borne these last four years to so many of the sons of Harvard, and to the soldier-sons of Massachusetts, forbade me to deny myself the honor of the meeting. And now that I rise to speak a few words of allusion to those who are not here, so many are the struggling memories and contending fancies that rush thick upon the heart, that I hardly know whether I address myself to the dim shadows and dusky reminiscences that have passed away, or to the more palpable forms of this real presence; and if there were words of human speech fit to portray their history, to speak their praise, or to deck their graves, those words, alas! they are not mine. They spring not from human lips; they are not born from oral speech. But there are testimonies more potent, more impressive, more electric than the human voice, and they are here to-day, in that cloud of living witnesses who have come back laden with glory from the fields where their comrades fell. Let them speak! Let the hero of Gettysburg by his presence speak! Of the ten sons of Harvard who left their fair young forms upon that gory field, let the young Murat of Harvard, the hero of twenty fights, by his presence speak! Let all these brave men, whatever uniform they wear, from that of the humble private to the more ambitious regalia of

the commander,—they who saw their brethren go down at Gettysburg, and bite the dust at Fredericksburg, beneath the wall, or sink below the stream,—let them speak? At Ball's Bluff, where many a young life was lost in the Potomac or on the Virginia shore, at Chancellorsville, on the James river, in front of Petersburg, down along the shore of North Carolina, up the rivers of South Carolina, up the Savannah, on the Gulf, before New Orleans, all the way up the Mississippi river, wherever on land or sea, on field or deck, our flag was borne, whether in victory or defeat, there stood the sons of Massachusetts and of Harvard College.

Your president has alluded to some of the statistics of the sons of Harvard. I have already mentioned the fact that ten fell at Gettysburg; seven also fell at Antietam; five at Fredericksburg; five at Cedar Mountain; three at Chancellorsville; three at Bull Run; three in the Wilderness, and three at Fort Wagner. I need not detain you with the statistics of other engagements where your brothers fell; but every arm of the service, military and naval, was represented from your college; every rank, from major-general to private, was represented from your college,—represented in life and in death,—from Wadsworth, the major-general of the class of 1828, who fell in the Wilderness, to Emerson, the private of the class of 1861, who fell at Chancellorsville. So also upon the sea, from the rear-admiral to the lieutenant, you find also there the sons of Harvard College.

My eye has fallen this afternoon upon at least two field officers, to say nothing of others who during the first seven days of the war marched either to the rescue of the national capital or to the deliverance of the key of the Potomac River—Fortress Monroe. And I ought not to omit, as the thought occurs to me in speaking, especial reference to that

Middlesex regiment, the Fifth Massachusetts militia, commanded by a graduate of Harvard College, who after their three months of duty had expired by voluntary election chose to remain to fight out the battle of Bull Run. And I know not that the history of the war records an instance of a single man who ever retired to the rear while the battle was going on, and he capable of service.

But not merely at the beginning and through the major part of the conflict, but down to its very close, your brethren remained, and two of your young brethren, Sumner Paine and Cabot Russell, who would have graduated in the class of the present year, laid down their lives in separate battles, one of them falling at Gettysburg and the other by the side of Colonel Shaw at Fort Wagner.

Nor did they win their honors in Massachusetts or New England regiments alone. Colonel Porter from New York fell at Cold Harbor; Colonel Peabody from Missouri fell at Pittsburg Landing; and not to delay you with the list of less conspicuous names, I beg your scrutiny of the catalogue laid before you,—to this record and roll of your honored sons,—as a testimony of the wide diffusiveness of the patriotism and military heroism exhibited by the sons of your honored university. I allude to it because it illustrates the wide range of influence which belongs to this ancient and revered seminary of learning.

Nor is any particular class of the people of New England or of the other States, who in their own persons or in the persons of their sons have resorted here for the purposes of learning, been found alone in these works of war more than in the other ways of patriotic duty; but from every class and employment and interest of human society they have rushed to the service of their country. The sacred profession as

well as the other learned professions has been amply represented; and I count it to be one of the crowning glories of the intellectual culture and intelligence in which properly you may take pride, that throughout the whole army of the Union the medical staff of Massachusetts stands pre-eminently and confessedly by universal consent the first. The first chaplain who laid down his life in the war was Arthur Fuller, your own brother of the Sixteenth Massachusetts, who, musket in hand, fell in front of Fredericksburg. All ages, too,—all ages of your alumni have been represented. It might easily have been true, were you to compare the ages without reference to the relationship of the men in the volunteer service or the regular service, on land or sea, that son and father and grandfather had been fighting at the same time on the same field and in defence of the same flag.

All the old historic names, or nearly all, which in former times have illustrated the fame of New England and the memories of the college, have been found upon the rosters of our volunteer regiments. I hardly know whether I ought to trust myself from mere recollection, to speak of half a dozen of them, since there are so many dozens who with equal honor ought to be remembered. But five names represented each by two brothers, whose lives consecrated to their country were at last laid a forfeit upon its altar need not be omitted. The family of Revere offered two brothers who gave their lives upon the field of battle; the name of Lowell two more,—two brothers slain in the conflict; the name of Abbott two more,—two brothers who from the field of battle ascended to immortality; the family of Dwight two more,—two brothers; the family of Stevens two more,—two brothers; and I speak no more than the simplicity of truth when I declare to you that if you will but look over the catalogue of

your college and compare the list of names with the more honorable names in all that has distinguished the public service, the science, the patriotism, the literary culture of New England, you will find them all represented in this sternest duty of modern patriotism.

There have been no nobler acts of specific personal heroism than those which have been performed by your own alumni. I see the name of one upon that immortal role of fame,—one not widely known, not destined by military rank to illustrious homage in the great hereafter, but one nobler than whom neither Lacedæmonian nor American patriotism ever knew. I mean Sergeant Brown of the Nineteenth Massachusetts, who after he was smitten with death on the field of Antietam refused to give up the colors of which he was the bearer, but with one desperate, determined rush in front of his lines, with the volcanic energy of his patriotic nature, just as his heart struggled with the throes of death, he stuck the staff of the flag deep into the earth, and falling lay there and died by its side, its ample folds waving aloft. I know no instance of more perfect, of more heroic gentility bespeaking a noble nature than the act performed by one captain of the Second Massachusetts, whose name I would not dare, in this connection, before this company and in his presence to speak; who, standing by the side of Lieutenant-Colonel Savage, one of the noblest of the sons of Massachusetts, of the boys of Harvard, fatally wounded, not believed by the enemy to be worth the saving, refused to surrender to the enemy until he had wrung from them the pledge that they would, in capturing him, save also his comrade and bear him back to the nearest hospital; declaring that if they did not, single-handed and alone, he would fight it out and sell his life at the dearest cost.

Your graduates, your fellow students, associated in their

family histories, not only with the patriotism of Massachusetts and of New England, but of the whole country, were associated not only at the beginning of the war, but at an early period with the volunteer militia of the Commonwealth. It occurs to me that there was one who bore a name not less honored than any other in western Massachusetts,—I mean Major William Sedgwick,—who was himself a lineal descendant of that Captain Robert Sedgwick who was the first commander of the ancient and honorable artillery of Massachusetts.

Therefore, when you trace yourselves back in the persons of your comrades through the public service of the country, either in peace or in war,—whether you trace yourselves back through the military service in time of war, but through that of the militia in time of peace, preparing for war,—whether you seek for illustrations of fidelity in camp or whether you seek for more striking and brilliant illustrations of bravery on the field, you find men who may be safely counted among the most conspicuous. All over the country in all parts of the great field,—not only in the Army of the Potomac, not only in the Army of Virginia, not only in the Army of North Carolina, but in all the Western armies, under whatever commander, whether Fremont, or Halleck, or Sherman, or Banks, or Grant,—you have found the sons of your own institution. As I sat down this morning I wrote off from the catalogue a few names, most of them the least conspicuous, because the least conspicuous would be the most truly illustrative just to show how far you have extended, and how wisely your soldier-boys have spread themselves over this vast theatre of war. Surgeon Wheelwright fell on the lower Mississippi; Lieutenant Ripley in Arkansas; Private Goodrich at Vicksburg; Lieutenant Leavitt at White

Stone Hill, Dacotah; Paymaster Bowman at New Orleans; Lieutenant Burrage at Lookout Mountain; Lieutenant Haven at Baton Rouge; and Private Tucker at Port Hudson.

But time would fail me were I to venture upon these illustrations or illustrations personal to any men. The work of the war is almost over. The hardships of these many campaigns have been nobly borne. The record of your heroism and valor upon the field has been made complete. God grant the present generation of men may not be called on to repeat the struggle! But the work of manhood and of duty is not complete; and I hold it a higher praise to this great and venerable institution of thought and of learning, that while she has been through the war among the foremost in the front ranks of patriotism in carrying forward the flag of our country upon the field, she is to-day the foremost in the front ranks of liberal thought, of progressive polities, of scientific and honest philosophy in America. And when I heard commencement day, the repeated testimonies of the coming prophets of the Harvard of 1865, I knew so rapidly has history been made within the last twenty years that the fulfilment of the prophecies will not be later than 1875. I am not one of those who are impatient for the visible progress of events; for well I know that wherever there is the prophet, and the truth behind him, there must follow as a part of the necessary providence of God in the order of human events, the historic fulfilment. You may build your monumental walls,—I applaud the loving purpose that would pile high in the air magnificent structures of eternal granite, piercing the sky and standing upon the solid base of earth immortal as the Pyramids, to preserve in indestructible, visible form the history of your patriotic brethren who now sleep beneath the dust; but there is a monument more enduring than brass;

there is a record more lasting and immortal than the page of history or the songs of poets—the grateful memory of mankind. The memory of mankind shall preserve their names when all monumental structures shall have sunk beneath the dust that covers us. You can make a monument that shall keep in remembrance not only your brethren, but yourselves, by making mankind your debtors by the fidelity with which you adhere to the truth and the doctrines for which they died. From ten thousand homes all over this broad, fair land, proud hearts, grateful hearts and tearful eyes remember them. For ten thousand ages, if you are faithful to their work, they and you shall be remembered, and the graves they fill shall be the door through which you and they shall enter immortality.

But I must not detain you upon this theme. They sleep well, and you remember fondly,

" So sleep the brave who sink to rest  
With all their country's wishes blest.  
When Spring, with dewy fingers cold,  
Returns to deck their hallowed mold,  
It there shall dress a sweeter sod  
Than fancy's feet have ever trod.  
By fairy hands their knell is rung,  
By forms unseen their dirge is sung;  
There Honor comes, a pilgrim gray,  
To bless the turf that wraps their clay,  
And Freedom shall awhile repair,  
To dwell a weeping hermit there."

---

### ON THE RETURN OF THE BATTLE FLAGS

[Major-General Couch, upon delivering the flags of the hundred Massachusetts regiments and batteries, December 22, 1865, addressed the governor in the following words:

" May it please your Excellency: We have come here to-day as the representatives of the army of volunteers furnished by Massachusetts for the suppression of the rebellion, bringing these colors in order to return them to the State which intrusted them to our keeping. You must, however, pardon us if we give them up with profound regret—for these tat-

tered shreds forcibly remind us of long and fatiguing marches, cold bivouacs, and many hard-fought battles. The rents in their folds, the battle-stains on their escutcheons, the blood of our comrades that has sanctified the soil of a hundred fields, attest the sacrifices that have been made, the courage and constancy shown, that the nation might live. It is, sir, a peculiar satisfaction and pleasure to us that you, who have been an honor to the State and nation, from your marked patriotism and fidelity throughout the war, and have been identified with every organization before you, are now here to receive back, as the State custodian of her precious relics, these emblems of the devotion of her sons. May it please your Excellency, the colors of the Massachusetts volunteers are returned to the State."

The governor replied:]

**G**ENERAL,—This pageant, so full of pathos and of glory, forms the concluding scene in the long series of visible actions and events in which Massachusetts has borne a part for the overthrow of rebellion and the vindication of the Union.

These banners return to the government of the Commonwealth through welcome hands. Borne, one by one, out of this Capitol during more than four years of civil war as the symbols of the nation and the Commonwealth, under which the battalions of Massachusetts departed to the field,—they come back again, borne hither by surviving representatives of the same heroic regiments and companies to which they were intrusted.

At the hands, General, of yourself, the ranking officer of the volunteers of the Commonwealth (one of the earliest who accepted a regimental command under appointment of the governor of Massachusetts)—and of this grand column of scarred and heroic veterans who guard them home, they are returned with honors becoming relics so venerable, soldiers so brave, and citizens so beloved.

Proud memories of many a field; sweet memories alike of valor and friendship; sad memories of fraternal strife; tender memories of our fallen brothers and sons, whose dying eyes looked last upon their flaming folds; grand memories of

heroic virtues sublimed by grief; exultant memories of the great and final victory of our country, our Union, and the righteous cause; thankful memories of a deliverance wrought out for human nature itself, unexampled by any former achievement of arms—immortal memories with immortal honors blended, twine around these splintered staves, weave themselves along the warp and woof of these familiar flags, war-worn, begrimed, and baptized with blood. Let “the brave heart, the trusty heart, the deep, unfathomable heart,” in words of more than mortal eloquence, uttered though unexpressed, speak the emotions of grateful veneration for which these lips of mine are alike too feeble and unworthy.

General, I accept these relics in behalf of the people and the government. They will be preserved and cherished amid all the vicissitudes of the future as mementoes of brave men and noble actions.

---

#### VALEDICTORY ADDRESS

DELIVERED TO THE TWO BRANCHES OF THE LEGISLATURE ON  
RETIRING FROM OFFICE, JANUARY 5, 1866

**G**ENTLEMEN OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,—The people of Massachusetts have vindicated alike their intelligence, their patriotism, their will, and their power; both in the cultivation of the arts of peace, and in the prosecution of just and unavoidable war. At the end of five years of executive administration I appear before a convention of the two Houses of her general court in the execution of a final duty.

For nearly all that period the Commonwealth as a loyal

State of the American Union has been occupied within her sphere of co-operation in helping to maintain by arms the power of the nation, the liberties of the people, and the rights of human nature.

Having contributed to the army and the navy—including regulars, volunteers, seamen, and marines, men of all arms and officers of all grades and of the various terms of service—an aggregate of 159,165 men; and having expended for the war out of her own treasury \$27,705,109,—besides the expenditures of her cities and towns she has maintained by the unfailing energy and economy of her sons and daughters her industry and thrift even in the waste of war. She has paid promptly, and in gold, all interest on her bonds,—including the old and the new,—guarding her faith and honor with every public creditor, while still fighting the public enemy; and now at last in retiring from her service I confess the satisfaction of having first seen all of her regiments and batteries (save two battalions) returned and mustered out of the army; and of leaving her treasury provided for by the fortunate and profitable negotiation of all the permanent loan needed or foreseen—with her financial credit maintained at home and abroad, her public securities unsurpassed, if even equalled, in value in the money market of the world by those of any State or of the nation.

I have already had the honor to lay before the general court, by special message to the Senate, a statement of all affairs which demand my own official communication. And it only remains for me to transfer at the appropriate moment the cares, the honors, and the responsibilities of office to the hands of that eminent and patriotic citizen on whose public experience and ability the Commonwealth so justly relies.

But perhaps before descending for the last time from this

venerable seat, I may be indulged in some allusion to the broad field of thought and statesmanship to which the war itself has conducted us. As I leave the Temple where, humbled by my unworthiness, I have stood so long like a priest of Israel sprinkling the blood of the holy sacrifice on the altar—I would fain contemplate the solemn and manly duties which remain to us who survive the slain, in honor of their memory and in obedience to God.

The nation having been ousted by armed rebellion of its just possession and the exercise of its constitutional jurisdiction over the territory of the rebel States, has now at last by the suppression of the rebellion (accomplished by the victories of the national arms over those of the rebels) regained possession and restored its own rightful sway.

The rebels had overthrown the loyal State governments. They had made war against the Union. The government of each rebel State had not only withdrawn its allegiance, but had given in its adhesion to another, namely, the Confederate government,—a government not only injurious by its very creation, but hostile to and in arms against the Union, asserting and exercising belligerent rights both on land and sea, and seeking alliances with foreign nations, even demanding the armed intervention of neutral powers.

The pretensions of this “Confederacy” were maintained for some four years in one of the most extensive, persistent, and bloody wars of history. To overcome it and maintain the rights and the very existence of the Union, our national government was compelled to keep on foot one of the most stupendous military establishments the world has ever known. And probably the same amount of force, naval and military, was never organized and involved in any national controversy.

On both sides there was war, with all its incidents, all its claims, its rights and its results.

The States in rebellion tried, under the lead of their new Confederacy, to conquer the Union; but in the attempt they were themselves conquered.

They did not revert by their rebellion nor by our conquest into "Territories." They did not commit suicide. But they rebelled, they went to war; and they were conquered.

A "Territory" of the United States is a possession or dependency of the United States having none of the distinctive constitutional attributes of a State. A Territory might be in rebellion; but not thereby cease to be a Territory. It would be properly described as a Territory in rebellion. Neither does a State in rebellion cease to be a State. It would be correctly described, a State in rebellion. And it would be subject to the proper consequences of rebellion both direct and incidental,—among which may be that of military government or supervision by the nation, determinable only by the nation at its own just discretion in the due exercise of the rights of war. The power to put an end to its life is not an attribute of a State of our Union. Nor can the Union put an end to its own life, save by an alteration of the national constitution, or by suffering such defeat in war as to bring it under the jurisdiction of a conqueror. The nation has a vested interest in the life of the individual State. The States have a vested interest in the life of the Union. I do not perceive, therefore, how a State has the power by its own action alone, without the co-operation of the Union, to destroy the continuity of its corporate life. Nor do I perceive how the national Union can by its own action, without the action or omission of the States, destroy the continuity

of its own corporate life. It seems to me that the stream of life flows through both State and nation from a double source; which is a distinguishing element of its vital power. Eccentricity of motion is not death; nor is abnormal action organic change.

The position of the rebel States is fixed by the constitution, and by the laws or rights of war. If they had conquered the Union they might have become independent, or whatever else it might have been stipulated they should become by the terms of an ultimate treaty of peace. But being conquered they failed in becoming independent, and they failed in accomplishing anything but their own conquest. They were still States,—though belligerents conquered. But they had lost their loyal organization as States, lost their present possession of their political and representative power in the Union. Under the constitution they have no means nor power of their own to regain it. But the exigency is provided for by that clause in the federal constitution in which the federal government guarantees a republican form of government to every State. The regular and formal method would be therefore for the national government to provide specifically for their reorganization.

The right and duty, however, of the general government under the circumstances of their present case is not the single one of reorganizing these disorganized States. The war imposed rights and duties peculiar to itself, and to the relations and the results of war. The first duty of the nation is to regain its own power. It has already made a great advance in the direction of its power.

If ours were a despotic government it might even now be thought that it had already accomplished the re-establishment of its power as a government. But ours being a repub-

lican and a popular government, it cannot be affirmed that the proper power of the government is restored until a peaceful, loyal and faithful state of mind gains a sufficient ascendancy in the rebel and belligerent States, to enable the Union and loyal citizens everywhere to repose alike on the purpose and the ability of their people in point of numbers and capacity, to assert, maintain, and conduct State governments, republican in form, loyal in sentiment and character, with safety to themselves and to the national whole. If the people, or too large a portion of the people of a given rebel State are not willing and able to do this, then the state of war still exists, or at least a condition consequent upon and incidental thereto exists, which only the exercise on our part of belligerent rights, or some of their incidents can meet or can cure. The rights of war must continue until the objects of the war have been accomplished and the nation recognizes the return of a state of peace. It is absolutely necessary then for the Union government to prescribe some reasonable test of loyalty to the people of the States in rebellion. It is necessary to require of them conformity to those arrangements which the war has rendered or proved to be necessary to the public peace and necessary as securities for the future. As the conquering party, the national government has the right to govern these belligerent States meanwhile, at its own wise and conscientious discretion, subject: 1st. To the demands of natural justice, humanity, and the usages of civilized nations. 2d. To its duty under the constitution, to guarantee republican governments to the States.

But there is no arbiter, save the people of the United States, between the government of the Union and those States. Therefore the precise things to be done, the precise way to do them, the precise steps to be taken, their order,

progress, and direction, are all within the discretion of the national government, in the exercise, both of its belligerent and its more strictly constitutional functions,—exercising them according to its own wise, prudent, and just discretion. Its duty is not only to restore those States, but also to make sure of a lasting peace of its own ultimate safety and the permanent establishment of the rights of all its subjects. To this end I venture the opinion that the government of the United States ought to require the people of those States to reform their constitutions:

1. Guaranteeing to the people of color, now the wards of the nation, their civil rights as men and women on an equality with the white population by amendments irrepealable in terms.
2. Regulating the elective franchise according to certain laws of universal application, and not by rules merely arbitrary, capricious, and personal.
3. Annulling the ordinances of secession.
4. Disaffirming the rebel debt, and
5. To ratify the anti-slavery amendment of the United States constitution by their legislatures.

And I would have all these questions save the fifth—the disposition of which is regulated by the federal constitution—put to the vote of the people themselves. We should neither be satisfied with the action of the conventions which have been held nor with what is termed the “loyal vote.” We want the popular vote. And the rebel vote is better than the loyal vote if on the right side. If it is not on the right side, then I fear those States are incapable at present of reorganization; the proper power of the Union government is not restored; the people of those States are not yet prepared to assume their original functions with safety to the Union;

and the state of war still exists; for they are contumacious and disobedient to the just demands of the Union, disowning the just conditions precedent to reorganization.

We are desirous of their reorganization and to end the use of the war power. But I am confident we cannot reorganize political society with any proper security: 1. Unless we let in the people to a co-operation, and not merely an arbitrarily selected portion of them. 2. Unless we give those who are, by their intelligence and character, the natural leaders of the people, and who surely will lead them by-and-by, an opportunity to lead them now.

I am aware that it has been a favorite dogma in many quarters, "No rebel voters." But it is impossible in certain States to have any voting by white men if only "loyal men"—that is, those who continued so during the rebellion—are permitted to vote. This proposition is so clear that the President adopted the expedient of assuming that those who had not risen above certain civil or military grades in the rebel public service, and who had neither inherited nor earned more than a certain amount of property, should be deemed and taken to be sufficiently harmless to be intrusted with the suffrage in the work of reorganization. Although there is some reason for assuming that the less conspicuous and less wealthy classes of men had less to do than their more towering neighbors in conducting the State into the rebellion and through it—still I do not imagine that either wealth or conspicuous position, which are only the accidents of men, or at most only external incidents, affect the substance of their characters. I think the poorer and less significant men who voted or fought for Southern independence had quite as little love for the Yankees, quite as much prejudice against the Abolitionists, quite as much contempt for the colored man,

and quite as much disloyalty at heart as their more powerful neighbors.

The true question is now not of past disloyalty but of present loyal purpose. We need not try to disguise the fact that we have passed through a great popular revolution. Everybody in the rebel States was disloyal with exceptions too few and too far between to comprise a loyal force sufficient to constitute the State, even now that the armies of the rebellion are overthrown. Do not let us deceive ourselves. The truth is the public opinion of the white race in the South was in favor of the rebellion. The colored people sympathized with the Union cause. To the extent of their intelligence they understood that the success of the South meant their continued slavery; that an easy success of the North meant leaving slavery just where we found it; that the war meant, if it lasted long enough—their emancipation. The whites went to war and supported the war because they hoped to succeed in it; since they wanted or thought they wanted separation from the Union, or Southern independence. There were then three great interests—there were the Southern whites, who as a body wished for what they called Southern independence; the Southern blacks who desired emancipation; the people of the “loyal States” who desired to maintain the constitutional rights and the territorial integrity of the nation. Some of us in the North had a strong hope, which by the favor of God has not been disappointed, out of our defence of the Union to accomplish the deliverance of our fellow men in bondage. But the loyal idea included emancipation, not for its own sake but for the sake of the Union—if the Union could be saved or served by it. There were many men in the South—besides those known as loyal—who did not like to incur the responsibility of war

against the Union; or who did not think the opportune moment had arrived to fight the North; or in whose hearts there was "a divided allegiance." But they were not the positive men. They were with very few exceptions not the leading minds, the courageous men, the impressive and powerful characters,—they were not the young and active men. And when the decisive hour came they went to the wall. No matter what they thought or how they felt about it; they could not stand, or they would not stand—certainly they did not stand against the storm. The revolution either converted them or swept them off their feet. Their own sons volunteered. They became involved in all the work and in all the consequences of the war. The Southern people—as a people—fought, toiled, endured, and persevered, with a courage, a unanimity, and a persistency not outdone by any people in any revolution. There was never an acre of territory abandoned to the Union while it could be held by arms. There was never a rebel regiment surrendered to the Union arms until resistance was overcome by force; or a surrender was compelled by the stress of battle or of military strategy. The people of the South, men and women, soldiers and civilians, volunteers and conscripts, in the army and at home followed the fortunes of the rebellion and obeyed its leaders so long as it had any fortunes or any leaders. Their young men marched up to the cannon's mouth a thousand times where they were mowed down like grain by the reapers when the harvest is ripe. Some men had the faculty and the faith in the rebel cause to become its leaders. The others had the faculty and faith to follow them.

All honor to the loyal few! But I do not regard the distinction between loyal and disloyal persons of the white race residing in the South during the rebellion as being for

present purposes a practical distinction. It is even doubtful whether the comparatively loyal few (with certain prominent and honorable exceptions), can be well discriminated from the disloyal mass. And since the President finds himself obliged to let in the great mass of the disloyal by the very terms of his proclamation of amnesty to a participation in the business of reorganizing the rebel States, I am obliged also to confess that I think to make one rule for the richer and higher rebels and another rule for the poorer and more lowly rebels is impolitic and unphilosophical. I find evidence in the granting of pardons that such also is the opinion of the President.

When the day arrives which must surely come, when an amnesty, substantially universal, shall be proclaimed, the leading minds of the South, who by temporary policy and artificial rules had been for the while disfranchised, will resume their influence and their sway. The capacity of leadership is a gift, not a device. They whose courage, talents, and will entitle them to lead, will lead. And these men—not then estopped by their own consent or participation in the business of reorganization—may not be slow to question the validity of great public transactions enacted during their own disfranchisement. If it is asked in reply, “What can they do?” and “What can come of their discontent?” I answer, that while I do not know just what they can do nor what may come of it, neither do I know what they may not attempt nor what they may not accomplish. I only know that we ought to demand and to secure the co-operation of the strongest and ablest minds and the natural leaders of opinion in the South. If we cannot gain their support of the just measures needful for the work of safe reorganization, reorganization will be delusive and full of danger.

Why not try them? They are the most hopeful subjects to deal with in the very nature of the case. They have the brain and the experience and the education to enable them to understand the exigencies of the present situation. They have the courage as well as the skill to lead the people in the direction their judgments point, in spite of their own and the popular prejudice. Weaker men, those of less experience, who have less hold on the public confidence are comparatively powerless. Is it consistent with reason and our knowledge of human nature to believe the masses of Southern men able to face about, to turn their backs on those they have trusted and followed, and to adopt the lead of those who have no magnetic hold on their hearts or minds? Re-organization in the South demands the aid of men of great moral courage, who can renounce their own past opinions and do it boldly; who can comprehend what the work is and what are the logical consequences of the new situation; men who have interests urging them to rise to the height of the occasion. They are not the strong men from whom weak, vacillating counsels come; nor are they the great men from whom come counsels born of prejudices and follies, having their root in an institution they know to be dead and buried beyond the hope of resurrection.

Has it never occurred to us all that we are now proposing the most wonderful and unprecedented of human transactions? The conquering government at the close of a great war is about restoring to the conquered rebels not only their local governments in the States, but their representative share in the general government of the country! They are, in their States, to govern themselves as they did before the rebellion. The conquered rebels are in the Union to help govern and control the conquering loyalists! These being

the privileges which they are to enjoy when reorganization becomes complete, I declare that I know not any safeguard, precaution, or act of prudence, which wise statesmanship might not recognize to be reasonable and just. If we have no right to demand guarantees for the future; if we have no right to insist upon significant acts of loyal submission from the rebel leaders themselves; if we have no right to demand the positive popular vote in favor of the guarantees we need; if we may not stipulate for the recognition of the just rights of the slaves, whom, in the act of suppressing the rebellion, we converted from slaves into freemen, then I declare that we had no right to emancipate the slaves nor to suppress the rebellion.

It may be asked: Why not demand the suffrage for colored men in season for their vote in the business of reorganization? My answer is—I assume that the colored men are in favor of those measures which the Union needs to have adopted. But it would be idle to reorganize those States by the colored vote. If the popular vote of the white race is not to be had in favor of the guarantees justly required, then I am in favor of holding on—just where we now are. I am not in favor of a surrender of the present rights of the Union to a struggle between a white minority aided by the freedmen on one hand, against a majority of the white race on the other. I would not consent, having rescued those States by arms from secession and rebellion, to turn them over to anarchy and chaos. I have however no doubt—none whatever—of our right to stipulate for colored suffrage. The question is one of statesmanship, not a question of constitutional limitation.

If it is urged that the suffrage question is one peculiarly for the States, I reply: so also that of the abolition of slavery

ordinarily would have been. But we are not now deciding what a loyal State acting in its constitutional sphere, and in its normal relations to the Union, may do; but what a rebel, belligerent, conquered State must do in order to be reorganized and to get back into those relations. And in deciding this I must repeat that we are to be governed only by justice, humanity, the public safety, and our duty to reorganize those conquered, belligerent States, as we can and when we can, consistently therewith.

In dealing with those States, with a view to fulfilling the national guarantee of a republican form of government, it is plain, since the nation is called upon to reorganize government, where no loyal republican State government is in existence, that it must of absolute necessity deal directly with the people themselves. If a State government were menaced and in danger of subversion, then the nation would be called upon to aid the existing government of the State in sustaining itself against the impending danger. But the present case is a different one. The State government was subverted in each rebel State more than four years ago. The State in its corporate capacity went into rebellion; and as long as it had the power waged and maintained against the nation rebellious war. There is no government in them to deal with. But there are the people. It is to the people we must go. It is through their people alone, and it is in their primary capacity alone as people, unorganized and without a government, that the nation is capable now of dealing with them at all. And therefore the government of the nation is obliged, by the sheer necessity of the case, to know who are the people of the State, in the sense of the national constitution, in order to know how to reach them. Congress, discerning new people, with new rights, and new duties and

new interests (of the nation itself even) springing from them, may rightfully stipulate in their behalf. If Congress perceives that it cannot fulfil its guarantee to all the people of a State, without such a stipulation, then it not only may, but it ought to, require and secure it. The guarantee is one concerning all, not merely a part of the people. And, though the government of a State might be of republican form, and yet not enfranchise its colored citizens; still the substance and equity of the guarantee would be violated, if, in addition to their non-enfranchisement, the colored people should be compelled to share the burdens of a State government, the benefits of which would enure to other classes,—to their own exclusion. A republican form of government is not of necessity just and good. Nor is another form, of necessity, unjust and bad. A monarch may be humane, thoughtful, and just to every class and to every man. A republic may be inhumane, regardless of, and unjust to some of its subjects. Our national government and most of the State governments were so, to those whom they treated as slaves, or whose servitude they aggravated by their legislation in the interest of slavery. The nation cannot hereafter pretend that it has kept its promise and fulfilled its guarantee, when it shall have only organized governments of republican form, unless it can look all the people in the face and declare that it has kept its promise with them all. The voting class alone, those who possessed the franchise under the State constitutions, were not the people. They never were the people. They are not now. They were simply the trustees of a certain power for the benefit of all the people, and not merely for their own advantage. The nation does not fulfil its guarantee by dealing with them alone. It may deal through them with the people. It may

accept their action as satisfactory in its discretion. But no matter who may be the agents through whom the nation reaches and deals with the people, that guaranty of the national constitution is fatally violated unless the nation secures to all the people of those disorganized States the substantial benefits and advantages of a "government." We cannot hide behind a word. We cannot be content with the form. The substance bargained for is a "government." The form is also bargained for, but that is only an incident. The people, and all the people alike, must have and enjoy the benefits and advantages of a government for the common good, the just and equal protection of each and all.

But what of the policy of the President? I am not able to consider his future policy. It is undisclosed. He seems to me to have left to Congress alone the questions controlling the conditions on which the rebel States shall resume their representative power in the federal government. It was not incumbent on the President to do otherwise. He naturally leaves the duty of theoretical reasoning to those whose responsibility it is to reach the just, practical conclusion. Thus far the President has simply used according to his proper discretion the power of commander-in-chief. What method he should observe was a question of discretion; in the absence of any positive law, to be answered by himself. He might have assumed, in the absence of positive law, during the process of reorganization, purely military methods. Had that been needful it would have been appropriate. If not necessary, then it would have been unjust and injurious. It is not just to oppress even an enemy merely because we have the power. In a case like the present it would be extremely impolitic and injurious to the nation itself. Bear in mind, ours is not a conquest by barbarians, nor by despots;

but by Christians and republicans. The commander-in-chief was bound to govern with a view to promoting the true restoration of the power of the Union, as I attempted to describe it in the beginning of this address, not merely with a view to the present, immediate control of the daily conduct of the people. He deemed it wise therefore to resort to the democratic principle, to use the analogies of republicanism and of constitutional liberty. He had the power to govern through magistrates under military or under civil titles. He could employ the agencies of popular and of representative assemblies. Their authority has its source, however, in his own war powers as commander-in-chief. If the peace of society, the rights of the government and of all its subjects are duly maintained, then the method may justify itself by its success as well as its intention. If he has assisted the people to reorganize their legislatures and to re-establish the machinery of local State government; though his method may be less regular than if an act of Congress had prescribed it, still it has permitted the people to feel their way back into the works and ways of loyalty, to exhibit their temper of mind and to "show their hands." Was it not better for the cause of free government, of civil liberty, to incur the risk of error in that direction than of error in the opposite one? It has proved that the national government is not drunk with power; that its four years' exercise of the dangerous rights of war has not affected its brain. It has shown that the danger of despotic centralism or of central despotism is safely over.

Meanwhile, notwithstanding the transmission of the seals to State magistrates chosen by vote in the States themselves; notwithstanding the inauguration, in fact, of local legislatures, the powers of war remain. The commander-in-chief has not abdicated. His generals continue in the field. They

still exercise military functions, according to the belligerent rights of the nation. What the commander-in-chief may hereafter do, whether less or more, depends I presume in great measure on what the people of the rebel States may do or forbear doing. I assume that, until the executive and legislative departments of the national government shall have reached the united conclusion that the objects of the war have been fully accomplished, the national declaration of peace is not and cannot be made.

The proceedings already had are only certain acts in the great drama of reorganization. They do not go for nothing; they were not unnecessary; nor do I approach them with criticism. But they are not the whole drama. Other acts are required for its completion. What they shall be depends in part on the wisdom of Congress to determine.

The doctrine of the President that—in the steps preliminary to reorganizing a State which is not and has not been theoretically cut off from the Union—he must recognize its own organic law antecedent to the rebellion, need not be contested. I adhere quite as strictly as he to the logical consequences of that doctrine. I agree that the rebel States ought to come back again into the exercise of their State functions and the enjoyment of their representative power,—by the action and by the votes of the same class of persons, namely, the same body of voters or tenants of political rights and privileges, by the votes, action or submission of whom, those States were carried into the rebellion.

But yet it may be at the same time needful and proper, in the sense of wise statesmanship, to require of them the amplification of certain privileges, the recognition of certain rights, the establishment of certain institutions, the redistribution even of political power—to be by them accorded and

executed through constitutional amendments or otherwise—as elements of acceptable reorganization; and as necessary to the readjustment of political society in harmony with the new relations, and the new basis of universal freedom, resulting from the rebellion itself. If these things are found to be required by wise statesmanship, then the right to exact them, as conditions of restoring those States to the enjoyment of their normal functions, is to be found just where the nation found the right to crush the rebellion and the incidental right of emancipating slaves.

Now, distinctions between men as to their rights, purely arbitrary, and not founded in reason nor in the nature of things, are not wise, statesmanlike nor “republican,” in the constitutional sense. If they ever are wise and statesmanlike they become so only where oligarchies, privileged orders, and hereditary aristocracies are wise and expedient.

There are two kinds of republican government however known to political science, namely: aristocratic republics and democratic republics, or those in which the government resides with a few persons or with a privileged body, and those in which it is the government of the people. I cannot doubt that nearly all men are prepared to admit that our governments—both State and national—are constitutionally democratic, representative republics. That theory of government is expressly set forth in the Declaration of Independence. The popular theory of government is again declared in the preamble to the federal constitution. The federal government is elaborately constructed according to the theory of popular and representative government and against the aristocratic theory in its distinguishing features. And in divers places the federal constitution in set terms presupposes the democratic and representative character of the governments

of the States; for examples, by assuming that they have legislatures, that their legislatures are composed of more than one body, and by aiming to prevent even all appearance of aristocratic form, by prohibiting the States from granting any title of nobility. In his recent message to Congress President Johnson affirms "the great distinguishing principle of the recognition of the rights of man" as the fundamental idea in all our governments. "The American system," he adds in the same paragraph, "rests on the assertion of the equal right of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to freedom of conscience, to the culture and exercise of all his faculties."

But is it pretended that the idea of a government of the people and for the people in the American sense is inclusive of the white race only or is exclusive of men of African descent? On what ground can the position rest?

The citizenship of free men of color, even in those States where no provision of law seemed to include them in the category of voters, has been frequently demonstrated, not only as a legal right but as a right asserted and enjoyed.

Nay more; both under the confederation and in the time of the adoption of the constitution of the United States all free native-born inhabitants of the States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, and North Carolina, though descended from African slaves, were not only citizens of those States but such of them as had the other necessary qualifications possessed the franchise of electors on equal terms with other citizens. And even Virginia declares in her ancient Bill of Rights, "that all men having sufficient evidence of permanent common interest with and attachment to the community have the right of suffrage." Wherever free colored men were recognized as free citizens or subjects but

were nevertheless not fully enfranchised, I think the explanation is found, not in the fact of their mere color nor of their antecedent servitude, but in the idea of their possible lapse into servitude again—of which condition their color was a badge and a continuing presumption. The policy of some States seems to have demanded that slavery should be the prevailing condition of all their inhabitants of African descent. In those States the possession of freedom by a colored man has therefore been treated as if that condition was only exceptional and transient. But wherever the policy and legislation of a State were originally dictated by men who saw through the confusion of ideas occasioned by the presence of slavery, there we are enabled to discern the evidence of an unclouded purpose (with which the American mind always intended to be consistent), namely: The maintenance of equality between free citizens concerning civil rights and the distribution of privileges, according to capacity and desert, and not according to the accidents of birth. And now that slavery has been rendered forever impossible within any State or Territory of the Union by framing the great natural law of universal freedom into the organic law of the Union, all the ancient disabilities which slavery had made apparently attendant on African descent must disappear.

Whatever may be the rules regulating the distribution of political power among free citizens in the organization of such a republican government as that guaranteed by the national constitution, descent in either the evidence of right nor the ground of disfranchisement.

The selection of a fraction or class of the great body of freemen in the civil State to be permanently invested with its entire political power (selected by mere human predestination irrespective of merit),—that power to be incommunicable to

the freemen of another class—the two classes, of rulers and ruled, governors and governed, to be determined by the accident of birth, and all the consequences of that accident to descend by generation to their children,—seems to me to be the establishment of an hereditary aristocracy of birth, the creation of a privileged order, inconsistent both with the substance and the essential form of American republicanism, unstatesmanlike, and unwise; and (in the rebel States) in every sense dangerous and unjust.

To demand a certain qualification of intelligence is eminently safe and consists with the interests and rights of all. It is as reasonable as to require a certain maturity of age. They who are the representatives of the political power of society, acting not only for themselves but also for the women and children, who, too, belong to it; representing the interests of the wives, mothers, sisters, daughters, infant sons, and the posterity of us all, ought to constitute an audience reasonably competent to hear. And since the congregation of American voters is numbered by millions, and covers a continent it cannot hear with its ears all that it needs to know; but must learn intelligently much that it needs to know through the printed page and by means of its eyes. The protection of the mass of men against the deceptions of local demagogues and against their own prejudices hereafter—as well as the common safety—calls for the requirement of the capacity to read the mother tongue as a condition of coming for the first time to the ballot-box. Let this be required at the South and immediately the whole Southern community will be aroused to the absolute necessity of demanding free schools and popular education. These are more than all things else to be coveted, both for the preservation of public liberty and for the temporal salvation of the toiling masses of our

own Saxon and Norman blood, whom alike with the African slave the oppression of ages has involved in a common disaster.

I think the wisest and most intelligent persons in the South are not ignorant of the importance of raising the standard of intelligence among voters; nor of extending the right to vote so as to include those who are of competent intellect notwithstanding the recent disability of color. There is evidence that they are not unwilling to act consistently with the understanding, example, and constitutional precedents of the fathers of the Republic; consistently with the ancient practice of the States, coeval with the organic law of the nation established by the very men who made that law, who used and adopted the very phrase, "a republican form of government," of the meaning of which their own practice was a contemporary interpretation. But if the conquering power of the nation, if the victorious arm of the Union is paralyzed; if the federal government, standing behind the ramparts of defensive war, wielding its weapons both of offence in the hour of struggle and of diplomacy in the hour of triumph, is utterly powerless to stipulate for the execution of this condition; then I confess I do not know how the best and wisest in the South will be enabled, deserted and alone, to stand up on its behalf against the jealousy of ignorance and the traditions of prejudice.

If the measures I have attempted to delineate are found to be impracticable then Congress has still the right to refuse to the rebel States readmission to the enjoyment of their representative power until amendments to the federal constitution shall have been obtained adequate to the exigency. Nor can the people of the rebel States object to the delay. They voluntarily withdrew from Congress; they themselves

elected the attitude of disunion. They broke the agreements of the constitution: not we. They chose their own time, opportunity, and occasion to make war on the nation and to repudiate the Union. They certainly cannot now dictate to us the time nor the terms. Again I repeat the just discretion of the nation — exercised in good faith toward all — must govern.

The federal Union was formed first of all "to establish justice." "Justice" in the language of statesmen and of jurists has had a definition for more than two thousand years, exact, perfect, and well understood.

It is found in the Institutes of Justinian,—

"*Constans et perpetua voluntas, jus suum cuique tribuendi.*"<sup>1</sup>

I believe I have shown that under our federal constitution,—

1. All the people of the rebel States must share in the benefits to be derived from the execution of the national guarantee of republican governments.
2. That our "republican form of government" demands "the maintenance of equality between free citizens concerning civil rights in the distribution of privileges according to capacity and desert and not according to the accidents of birth."
3. That people "of African descent" not less than people of the white race are included within the category of free subjects and citizens of the United States.
4. That, in the distribution of political power under our form of government, "descent is neither the evidence of right nor the ground of disfranchisement," so that

---

<sup>1</sup> "The constant and perpetual will to secure to every man his own right."

5. The disfranchisement of free citizens for the cause of "descent" or for any reason other than lawful disqualification, as by non-residence, immaturity, crime, or want of intelligence, violates their constitutional rights.

6. That in executing our national guarantee of republican government to the people of the rebel States, we must secure the constitutional, civic liberties and franchises of all the people.

7. That we have no right to omit to secure to the new citizens, made free by the Union, in war, their equality of rights before the law, and their franchises of every sort—including the electoral franchise—according to laws and regulations, of universal, and not of unequal and capricious application.

We have no right to evade our own duty. We must not, by substituting a new basis for the apportionment of representatives in Congress, give up the just rights of these citizens. Increasing the proportion of the political power of the loyal States, at the expense of the disloyal States, by adopting their relative numbers of legal voters, instead of their relative populations—while it might punish some States for not according the suffrage to colored men—would not be justice to the colored citizen. For justice demands, "for every man his own right."

Will it be said that, by such means, we shall strengthen our own power in the loyal States, to protect the colored people in the South? If we will not yield to them justice now, on what ground do we expect grace to give them "protection" hereafter?

You will have compromised for a consideration—paid in an increase of your own political power—your right to urge their voluntary enfranchisement on the white men of the

South. You will have bribed all the elements of political selfishness, in the whole country, to combine against negro enfranchisement. The States of the rebellion will have no less power than ever in the Senate. And the men who hold the privilege of electing representatives to the lower house, will retain their privilege. For the sake of doubling the delegation from South Carolina, do you suppose the monopoly of choosing three members would be surrendered by the whites, giving to the colored men the chance to choose six? Nay:—Would the monopolists gain anything by according the suffrage to the colored man; if they could themselves only retain the power to dictate three representatives, and the colored people should dictate the selection of the other three?

The scheme to substitute legal voters, instead of population, as the basis of representation in Congress, will prove a delusion and a snare. By diminishing the representative power of the Southern States, in favor of other States, you will not increase Southern love for the Union. Nor, while Connecticut and Wisconsin refuse the suffrage to men of color, will you be able to convince the South that your amendment was dictated by political principle, and not by political cupidity. You will not diminish any honest apprehension at extending the suffrage, but you will inflame every prejudice, and aggravate discontent. Meanwhile the disfranchised freedman, hated by some because he is black, contemned by some because he has been a slave, feared by some because of the antagonisms of society, is condemned to the condition of a hopeless pariah of a merciless civilization. In the community, he is not of it. He neither belongs to a master nor to society. Bodily present in the midst of the society composing the State, he adds nothing to its weight

in the political balance of the nation ; and therefore, he stands in the way, occupies the room and takes the place, which might be enjoyed as opportunities by a white immigrant, who would contribute by his presence to its representative power. Your policy would inflame animosity and aggravate oppression, for at least the lifetime of a generation, before it would open the door to enfranchisement.

Civil society is not an aggregation of individuals. According to the order of nature and the divine economy it is an aggregation of families.

The adult males of the family vote because the welfare of the women and children of the family is identical with theirs ; and it is intrusted to their affection and fidelity, whether at the ballot-box or on the battle-field. But, while the voting men of a given community represent the welfare of its women and children, they do not represent that of another community. The men, women, and children of Massachusetts are alike concerned in the ideas and interests of Massachusetts. But the very theory of representation implies that the ideas and interests of one State are not identical with those of another. On what ground, then, can a State on the Pacific or the Ohio gain preponderance in Congress over New Jersey or Massachusetts by reason of its greater number of males, while it may have even a less number of people? The halls of legislation are the arenas of debate, not of muscular prowess. The intelligence, the opinions, the wishes, and the influence of women, social and domestic, stand for something—for much—in the public affairs of civilized and refined society. I deny the just right of the government to banish woman from the count. She may not vote, but she thinks; she persuades her husband; she instructs her son. And through them at least she has a right

to be heard in the government. Her existence and the existence of her children are to be considered in the State.

No matter who changes, let Massachusetts at least stand by all the fundamental principles of free, constitutional, republican government.

The President is the tribune of the people. Let him be chosen directly by the popular election. The Senate represents the reserved rights and the equality of the States. Let the senators continue to be chosen by the legislatures of the States. The House represents the opinions, interests, and the equality of the people of each and every State. Let the people of the respective States elect their representatives, in numbers proportional to the numbers of their people. And let the legal qualifications of the voters, in the election of President, Vice-President, and representatives in Congress, be fixed by a uniform, equal, democratic, constitutional rule, of universal application. Let this franchise be enjoyed "according to capacity and desert, and not according to the accidents of birth."

Congress may, and ought to, initiate an amendment granting the right to vote for President, Vice-President and representatives in Congress, to colored men, in all the States, being citizens and able to read, who would by the laws of the States where they reside, be competent to vote if they were white. Without disfranchising existing voters, it should apply the qualification to white men also. And the amendment ought to leave the election of President and Vice-President directly in the hands of the people, without the intervention of electoral colleges. Then the poorest, humblest, and most despised men, being citizens and competent to read, and thus competent, with reasonable intelligence, to represent others, would find audience through the ballot-box.

The President, who is the grand tribune of all the people, and the direct delegates of the people in the popular branch of the national legislature, would feel their influence. This amendment would give efficiency to the one already adopted, abolishing slavery throughout the Union. The two amendments taken together would practically accomplish or enable Congress to fulfil the whole duty of the nation to those who are now its dependent wards.

I am satisfied that the mass of thinking men at the South accept the present condition of things in good faith; and I am also satisfied that with the support of a firm policy from the President and Congress in aid of the efforts of their good faith, and with the help of a conciliatory and generous disposition on the part of the North—especially on the part of those States most identified with the plan of emancipation—the measures needed for permanent and universal welfare can surely be obtained. There ought now to be a vigorous prosecution of the peace,—just as vigorous as our recent prosecution of the war. We ought to extend our hands with cordial good will to meet the proffered hands of the South; demanding no attitude of humiliation from any; inflicting no acts of humiliation upon any; respecting the feelings of the conquered—notwithstanding the question of right and wrong between the parties belligerent. We ought, by all the means and instrumentalities of peace, and by all the thrifty methods of industry; by all the recreative agencies of education and religion to help rebuild the waste places and restore order, society, prosperity. Without industry and business there can be no progress. In their absence civilized man even recedes toward barbarism. Let Massachusetts bear in mind the not unnatural suspicion which the past has engendered. I trust she is able, filled with emotions

of boundless joy and gratitude to Almighty God who has given such victory and such honor to the right, to exercise faith in his goodness without vain glory, and to exercise charity without weakness toward those who have held the attitude of her enemies.

The offence of war has met its appropriate punishment by the hand of war.

In this hour of triumph, honor and religion alike forbid one act, one word of vengeance or resentment. Patriotism and Christianity unite the arguments of earthly welfare, and the motives of heavenly inspiration to persuade us to put off all jealousy and all fear, and to move forward as citizens and as men in the work of social and economic reorganization—each one doing with his might whatever his hand findeth to do.

We might wish it were possible for Massachusetts justly to avoid her part in the work of political reorganization. But in spite of whatever misunderstanding of her purpose or character she must abide her destiny. She is a part of the nation. The nation for its own ends and its own advantage, as a measure of war, took out of the hands of the masters their slaves. It holds them therefore in its hands as freedmen. It must place them somewhere. It must dispose of them somehow. It cannot delegate the trust. It has no right to drop them, to desert them. For by its own voluntary act it assumed their guardianship and all its attendant responsibilities before the present generation, and all the coming generations of mankind. I know not how well, nor how ill, they might be treated by the people of the States where they reside. I only know that there is a point beyond which the nation has no right to incur any hazard. And while the fidelity of the nation need not abridge the humanity of the

States, on the other hand our confidence in those States cannot be pleaded before the bar of God, nor of history in defence of any neglect of our own duty.

Let their people remember that Massachusetts has never deceived them. To her ideas of duty and her theory of the government she has been faithful. If they were ever misled or betrayed by others into the snare of attempted secession and the risks of war, her trumpet at least gave no uncertain sound. She has fulfilled her engagements in the past and she intends to fulfil them in the future. She knows that the reorganization of the States in rebellion carries with it consequences which come home to the firesides and the consciences of her own children. For as citizens of the Union they become liable to assume the defence of those governments when reorganized, against every menace, whether of foreign invasion or of domestic violence. Her bayonets may be invoked to put down insurgents of whatever color; and whatever the cause, whether rightful or wrongful, which may have moved their discontent. And when they are called for they will march. If she were capable of evading her duty now she would be capable of violating her obligations hereafter. If she is anxious to prevent grave errors, it is because she appreciates, from her past experience, the danger of admitting such errors into the structure of government. She is watchful against them now, because in the sincere fidelity of her purpose she is made keenly alive to the duties of the present, by contemplating the inevitable responsibilities of the future.

In sympathy with the heart and hope of the nation, she will abide by her faith. Undisturbed by the impatient, undismayed by delay, "with malice toward none, with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the

right," she will persevere. Impartial, democratic, constitutional liberty is invincible. The rights of human nature are sacred; maintained by confessors, and heroes, and martyrs; reposing on the sure foundation of the commandments of God.

"Through plots and counterplots;  
Through gain and loss; through glory and disgrace;  
Along the plains where passionate Discord rears  
Eternal Babel; still the holy stream  
Of human happiness glides on!

• • • • •  
There is One above  
Sways the harmonious mystery of the world."

Gentlemen, for all the favors, unmerited and unmeasured, which I have enjoyed from the people of Massachusetts; from the councillors, magistrates, and officers by whom I have been surrounded in the government; and from the members of five successive legislatures, there is no return in my power to render but the sincere acknowledgments of a grateful heart.

# JOHN RUSKIN



JOHN RUSKIN, a distinguished English art critic and prose writer, the son of a wealthy wine merchant of Scotch descent, was born at London, Feb. 8, 1819, and died at his Lancashire home, "Brantwood," near Coniston, Jan. 20, 1900. In 1842, he graduated from Oxford, winning at his college the Newdigate prize for a poem describing the dawn of Christianity in Hindustan. Passing from college, he appears to have been stirred by some strictures upon Turner's works and took up his pen in the artist's defence, though with the design of upholding the principles of truth and beauty embodied in that master's art. To this end he devoted the early volumes of his work on "Modern Painters" (1843-60), which was followed by his "Stones of Venice" and "The Seven Lamps of Architecture." From 1870 to 1879 he was Slade Professor of Art at Oxford. Besides art, his themes embraced political economy, education, and social science, in all of which subjects he had something thoughtful and stimulating to say and exercised a wholesome and inspiring moral as well as aesthetic influence. His work as a writer and teacher of his age extended over a period of fifty years, rendered fascinating by great charm of literary style. This work embraced, in addition to the books above mentioned and a mass of letters, lectures, and miscellaneous magazine articles, "Sesame and Lilies," dealing with questions of social life and politics; "The Crown of Wild Olive," treating of work, traffic, war, and the future of England; "The Queen of the Air," lectures on Greek Myths; "Unto this Last," concerning the responsibilities and duties of those called to fill offices of national trust and service; "Fors Clavigera," a series of letters to working men; "Munera Pulveris," treating of commerce, government, wealth, money, riches, etc., and "Ethics of the Dust," lectures to little housewives on the elements of crystallization. In all this mass of varied matter, while there is not a little that is fanciful, there is much to inform and instruct, as well as to inspire and elevate. He shines most, however, as an interpreter of nature and an unveiler of the Divine meanings in creation, for with his intense sense of beauty and great spirituality of mind, he recognizes and reminds the reader of the majesty of God in the world.

## ON THE GREEK MYTHS

FROM LECTURE DELIVERED AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON,  
MARCH 9, 1869

I WILL not ask your pardon for endeavoring to interest you in the subject of Greek mythology; but I must ask your permission to approach it in a temper differing from that in which it is frequently treated. We cannot justly interpret the religion of any people unless we are pre-

pared to admit that we ourselves, as well as they, are liable to error in matters of faith, and that the convictions of others, however singular, may in some points have been well founded, while our own, however reasonable, may in some particulars be mistaken. You must forgive me, therefore, for not always distinctively calling the creeds of the past "superstition," and the creeds of the present day "religion;" as well as for assuming that a faith now confessed may sometimes be superficial, and that a faith long forgotten may once have been sincere. It is the task of the Divine to condemn the errors of antiquity, and of the philologists to account for them; I will only pray you to read with patience and human sympathy the thoughts of men who lived without blame in a darkness they could not dispel; and to remember that whatever charge of folly may justly attach to the saying, "There is no God," the folly is prouder, deeper, and less pardonable in saying, "There is no God but for me."

A myth, in its simplest definition, is a story with a meaning attached to it other than it seems to have at first; and the fact that it has such a meaning is generally marked by some of its circumstances being extraordinary, or, in the common use of the word, unnatural. Thus if I tell you that Hercules killed a water-serpent in the lake of Lerna, and if I mean, and you understand, nothing more than that fact, the story, whether true or false, is not a myth. But if by telling you this I mean that Hercules purified the stagnation of many streams from deadly miasmata, my story, however simple, is a true myth; only, as if I left it in that simplicity you would probably look for nothing beyond, it will be wise in me to surprise your attention by adding some singular circumstance; for instance, that the water-snake had several heads which revived as fast as they were killed, and which

poisoned even the foot that trod upon them as they slept. And in proportion to the fulness of intended meaning I shall probably multiply and refine upon these improbabilities; as, suppose if, instead of desiring only to tell you that Hercules purified a marsh, I wished you to understand that he contended with the venom and vapor of envy and evil ambition, whether in other men's souls or in his own, and choked that malaria only by supreme toil,—I might tell you that this serpent was formed by the goddess whose pride was in the trial of Hercules; and that its place of abode was by a palm-tree; and that for every head of it that was cut off two rose up with renewed life; and that the hero found at last he could not kill the creature at all by cutting its heads off or crushing them, but only by burning them down; and that the midmost of them could not be killed even that way, but had to be buried alive. Only in proportion as I mean more, I shall certainly appear more absurd in my statement; and at last when I get unendurably significant, all practical persons will agree that I was talking mere nonsense from the beginning and never meant anything at all.

It is just possible however also that the story-teller may all along have meant nothing but what he said; and that, incredible as the events may appear, he himself literally believed—and expected you also to believe—all this about Hercules, without any latent moral or history whatever. And it is very necessary in reading traditions of this kind to determine first of all whether you are listening to a simple person who is relating what at all events he believes to be true (and may therefore possibly have been so to some extent), or to a reserved philosopher, who is veiling a theory of the universe under the grotesque of a fairy tale. It is, in general, more likely that the first supposition should be the

right one: simple and credulous persons are, perhaps fortunately, more common than philosophers; and it is of the highest importance that you should take their innocent testimony as it was meant, and not efface under the graceful explanation which your cultivated ingenuity may suggest, either the evidence their story may contain (such as it is worth) of an extraordinary event having really taken place, or the unquestionable light which it will cast upon the character of the person by whom it was frankly believed. And to deal with Greek religion honestly you must at once understand that this literal belief was, in the mind of the general people, as deeply rooted as ours in the legends of our own sacred book; and that a basis of unmiraculous event was as little suspected, and an explanatory symbolism as rarely traced by them as by us.

You must therefore observe that I deeply degrade the position which such a myth as that just referred to occupied in the Greek mind by comparing it (for fear of offending you) to our story of St. George and the Dragon. Still the analogy is perfect in minor respects; and though it fails to give you any notion of the vitally religious earnestness of the Greek faith it will exactly illustrate the manner in which faith laid hold of its objects.

This story of Hercules and the Hydra, then, was to the general Greek mind, in its best days, a tale about a real hero and a real monster. Not one in a thousand knew anything of the way in which the story had arisen, any more than the English peasant generally is aware of the plebeian original of St. George, or supposes that there were once alive in the world, with sharp teeth and claws, real and very ugly flying dragons. On the other hand, few persons traced any moral or symbolical meaning in the story, and the average Greek

was as far from imagining any interpretation like that I have just given you as an average Englishman is from seeing in St. George the Red Cross Knight of Spenser, or in the Dragon the spirit of infidelity. But for all that there was a certain undercurrent of consciousness in all minds that the figures meant more than they at first showed; and according to each man's own faculties of sentiment he judged and read them; just as a Knight of the Garter reads more in the jewel on his collar than the George and Dragon of a public-house expresses to the host or to his customers. Thus to the mean person the myth always meant little; to the noble person, much; and the greater their familiarity with it the more contemptible it became to one and the more sacred to the other, until vulgar commentators explained it entirely away, while Virgil made it the crowning glory of his choral hymn to Hercules.

"Around thee, powerless to infect thy soul  
Rose, in his crested crowd, the Lerna *word*..."

"Non te rationis egentem  
Lernæus turbâ capitum circumstetit anguis."

And although, in any special toil of the hero's life, the moral interpretation was rarely with definiteness attached to its event, yet in the whole course of the life, not only a symbolical meaning, but the warrant for the existence of a real spiritual power, was apprehended of all men. Hercules was no dead hero, to be remembered only as a victor over monsters of the past—harmless now as slain. He was the perpetual type and mirror of heroism and its present and living aid against every ravenous form of human trial and pain.

But if we seek to know more than this and to ascertain the manner in which the story first crystallized into its shape, we shall find ourselves led back generally to one or other of two sources,—either to actual historical events, represented

by the fancy under figures personifying them; or else to natural phenomena similarly endowed with life by the imaginative power usually more or less under the influence of terror. The historical myths we must leave the masters of history to follow; they and the events they record being yet involved in great, though attractive and penetrable mystery. But the stars, and hills, and storms are with us now, as they were with others of old; and it only needs that we look at them with the earnestness of those childish eyes to understand the first words spoken of them by the children of men, and then, in all the most beautiful and enduring myths we shall find not only a literal story of a real person, not only a parallel imagery of moral principle, but an underlying worship of natural phenomena out of which both have sprung and in which both forever remain rooted. Thus, from the real sun rising and setting,—from the real atmosphere, calm in its dominion of unfading blue and fierce in the descent of tempest,—the Greek forms first the idea of two entirely personal and corporeal gods, whose limbs are clothed in divine flesh, and whose brows are crowned with divine beauty; yet so real that the quiver rattles at their shoulder and the chariot bends beneath their weight. And on the other hand, collaterally with these corporeal images, and never for one instant separated from them, he conceives also two omnipresent spiritual influences, of which one illuminates as the sun with a constant fire, whatever in humanity is skilful and wise; and the other, like the living air, breathes the calm of heavenly fortitude and strength of righteous anger into every human breast that is pure and brave.

Now, therefore, in nearly every myth of importance and certainly in every one of those of which I shall speak to-night, you have to discern these three structural parts,—

the root and the two branches : the root, in physical existence, sun, or sky, or cloud, or sea ; then the personal incarnation of that becoming a trusted and companionable deity with whom you may walk hand in hand, as a child with its brother or its sister ; and lastly, the moral significance of the image which is in all the great myths eternally and beneficently true.

The great myths ; that is to say, myths made by great people. For the first plain fact about myth-making is one which has been most strangely lost sight of,—that you cannot make a myth unless you have something to make it of. You cannot tell a secret which you don't know. If the myth is about the sky it must have been made by somebody who had looked at the sky. If the myth is about justice and fortitude it must have been made by some one who knew what it was to be just or patient. According to the quantity of understanding in the person will be the quantity of significance in his fable ; and the myth of a simple and ignorant race must necessarily mean little, because a simple and ignorant race have little to mean. So the great question in reading a story is always, not what wild hunter dreamed, or what childish race first dreaded it; but what wise man first perfectly told, and what strong people first perfectly lived by it. And the real meaning of any myth is that which it has at the noblest age of the nation among whom it is current. The farther back you pierce the less significance you will find, until you come to the first narrow thought, which indeed contains the germ of the accomplished tradition ; but only as the seed contains the flower. As the intelligence and passion of the race develop, they cling to and nourish their beloved and sacred legend ; leaf by leaf it expands under the touch of more pure affections and more delicate imagination until

at last the perfect fable burgeons out into symmetry of milky stem and honeyed bell.

But through whatever changes it may pass, remember that our right reading of it is wholly dependent on the materials we have in our own minds for an intelligent answering sympathy. If it first arose among a people who dwelt under stainless skies and measured their journeys by ascending and declining stars, we certainly cannot read their story if we have never seen anything above us in the day but smoke, nor anything around us in the night but candles. If the tale goes on to change clouds or planets into living creatures,—to invest them with fair forms and inflame them with mighty passions,—we can only understand the story of the human-hearted things in so far as we ourselves take pleasure in the perfectness of visible form, or can sympathize by an effort of imagination with the strange people who had other loves than that of wealth and other interests than those of commerce. And, lastly, if the myth complete itself to the fulfilled thoughts of the nation by attributing to the gods whom they have carved out of their fantasy continual presence with their own souls, and their every effort for good is finally guided by the sense of the companionship, the praise and the pure will of immortals, we shall be able to follow them into this last circle of their faith only in the degree in which the better parts of our own beings have been also stirred by the aspects of nature or strengthened by her laws. It may be easy to prove that the ascent of Apollo in his chariot signifies nothing but the rising of the sun. But what does the sunrise itself signify to us? If only languid return to frivolous amusement or fruitless labor, it will indeed not be easy for us to conceive the power, over a Greek of the name of Apollo. But if for us also, as for the Greek, the sunrise

means daily restoration to the sense of passionate gladness and of perfect life; if it means the thrilling of new strength through every nerve,—the shedding over us of a better peace than the peace of night in the power of the dawn,—and the purging of evil vision and fear by the baptism of its dew; if the sun itself is an influence to us also of spiritual good, and becomes thus in reality, not in imagination to us also, a spiritual power,—we may then soon over-pass the narrow limit of conception which kept that power impersonal and rise with the Greek to the thought of an angel who rejoiced as a strong man to run his course, whose voice calling to life and to labor rang round the earth, and whose going forth was to the ends of heaven.

# JAMES R. LOWELL



AMES RUSSELL LOWELL, a distinguished American poet, essayist, scholarly man of letters, and diplomat, was born at Cambridge, Mass., Feb. 22, 1819, and died there Aug. 12, 1891. In 1838, he graduated from Harvard and three years later issued a volume of his early poems, entitled "A Year's Life," which showed facility in versification, but with little promise of genius. In 1846, at the outbreak of the Mexican War, he published a poem in the Yankee dialect bristling with sarcasm and overflowing with pungent humor, in which he denounced the upholders of slavery. This was "The Biglow Papers," which more than anything else of his, contributed to his fame. He threw himself heart and soul into the anti-slavery movement and wielded a great influence by his wit and caustic verse. His "Fable for Critics" pictured in dashing verse in a series of clever sketches many of his contemporaries. In 1855, after a lengthy residence in Europe, he succeeded Longfellow as professor of modern languages at Harvard. At the same time he edited the "Atlantic Monthly," and from 1863 until 1867 he was associate editor of the "North American Review." In 1865, he produced his "Commemoration Ode," which many critics deem the finest poem so far produced in America. His other volumes of verse include "The Vision of Sir Launfal," a story of the Holy Grail; "The Cathedral," and "Heartsease and Rue." In 1877, he was appointed United States Minister to Spain, and three years later became minister to the Court of St. James, London, where he remained until 1885, winning vast popularity by his geniality and tact. Among his prose works are "My Study Windows" and "Among My Books," "Democracy," a volume of his addresses in England, and "A Life of Hawthorne" (1890).

## ORATION AT THE 250TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF HARVARD COLLEGE

DELIVERED AT CAMBRIDGE, NOVEMBER 8, 1886

**I**T seems an odd anomaly that while respect for age and deference to its opinions have diminished, and are still sensibly diminishing among us, the relish of antiquity should be more pungent and the value set upon things merely because they are old should be greater in America than anywhere else. It is merely a sentimental relish, for ours is a new country in more senses than one, and like children when

they are fancying themselves this or that, we have to play very hard in order to believe that we are old.

But we like the game none the worse and multiply our anniversaries with honest zeal, as if we increased our centuries by the number of events we could congratulate ourselves on having happened a hundred years ago. There is something of instinct in this, and it is a wholesome instinct if it serve to quicken our consciousness of the forces that are gathered by duration and continuity; if it teach us that, ride fast and far as we may, we carry the past on our crupper, as immovably seated there as the black care of the Roman poet. The generations of men are braided inextricably together, and the very trick of our gait may be countless generations older than we. . . .

Are we to suppose that these memories were less dear and gracious to the Puritan scholars at whose instigation this college was founded than to that other Puritan who sang in the dim religious light, the long-drawn aisles and fretted vaults, which these memories recalled? Doubtless all these things were present to their minds, but they were ready to forego them all for the sake of that truth whereof, as Milton says of himself, they were members incorporate.

The pitiful contrast which they must have felt between the carven sanctuaries of learning they had left behind and the wattled fold they were rearing here on the edge of the wilderness is to me more than tenderly—it is almost sublimely—pathetic. When I think of their unpliant strength of purpose, their fidelity to their ideal, their faith in God and in themselves, I am inclined to say, with Donne, that

“We are scarce our fathers’ shadows cast at noon.”

Our past is well-nigh desolate of æsthetic stimulus. We

have none, or next to none, of these aids to the imagination, of these coigns of vantage for the tendrils of memory or affection. Not one of our older buildings is venerable or will ever become so. Time refuses to console them. They all look as though they meant business and nothing more. And it is precisely because this college meant business—business of the gravest import—and did that business as thoroughly as it might with no means that were not niggardly, except an abundant purpose to do its best, it is precisely for this that we have gathered to-day. We come back hither from the experiences of a richer life as the son who has prospered returns to the household of his youth, to find in its very homeliness a pulse, if not of deeper, certainly of fonder emotion than any splendor could stir. "Dear old mother," we say, "How charming you are in your plain cap and the drab silk that has been turned again since we saw you! You were constantly forced to remind us that you could not afford to give us this and that which some other boys had, but your discipline and diet were wholesome, and you sent us forth into the world with the sound constitutions and healthy appetites that are bred of simple fare."

It is good for us to commemorate this homespun past of ours; good in these days of reckless and swaggering prosperity, to remind ourselves how poor our fathers were, and that we celebrate them because for themselves and their children they chose wisdom and understanding and the things that are of God rather than any other riches. This is our Founders' Day, and we are come together to do honor to them all. First, to the Commonwealth, which laid our cornerstone; next, to the gentle and godly youth from whom we took our name—himself scarce more than a name—and with them to the countless throng of benefactors, rich and poor,

who have built us up to what we are. We cannot do it better than in the familiar words:

“ Let us now praise famous men and our fathers that begat us. The Lord hath wrought great glory by them through his great power from the beginning. Leaders of the people by their counsels, and, by their knowledge of learning, meet for the people; wise and eloquent in their instructions. There be of them that have left a name behind them that their praises might be reported. And some there be which have no memorial, who are perished as though they had never been. But these were merciful men whose righteousness hath not been forgotten. With their seed shall continually remain a good inheritance. Their seed standeth fast and their children for their sakes.”

This 250th anniversary of our college is not remarkable as commemorating any venerable length of days. There is hardly a country in Europe that cannot show us universities that were older than ours now is when ours was but a grammar school with Eaton as master. Bologna, Paris, Oxford were already famous schools when Dante visited them six hundred years ago. We are ancient, it is true, on our own continent, ancient even as compared with several German universities more renowned than we. It is not, then, primarily the longevity of our alma mater upon which we are gathered here to congratulate her and each other.

Kant says, somewhere, that as the record of human transactions accumulate, the memory of man will have room only for those of supreme cosmopolitan importance. Can we claim for the birthday we are keeping a significance of so wide a bearing and so long a reach? If we may not do that, we may at least affirm, confidently, that the event it records and emphasizes is second in real import to none that has happened in this western hemisphere. The material growth of the colonies would have brought about their political

separation from the mother country in the fulness of time, without that stain of blood which unhappily keeps its own memory green so long.

But the founding of the first English college here was what saved New England from becoming a mere geographical expression. It did more, for it ensured, and I believe was meant to ensure, our intellectual independence of the Old World. That independence has been long in coming, but it will come at last; and are not the names of the chiefest of those who have hastened its coming written on the roll of Harvard College?

I think this foundation of ours a quite unexampled thing. Surely never were the bases of such a structure as this has become, and was meant to be, laid by a community of men so poor, in circumstances so unprecedented, and under what seemed such sullen and averted stars. The colony was in danger of an Indian war, was in the throes of that Antinomian controversy which threatened its very existence, yet the leaders of opinion on both sides were united in the resolve that sound learning and an educated clergy should never cease from among them or their descendants in the Commonwealth they were building up.

In the midst of such fears and such tumults Harvard College was born; and not Marina herself had a more blusterous birth or a more chiding nativity. The prevision of those men must have been as clear as their faith was steadfast. Well they knew and had laid to heart the wise man's precept, "Take fast hold of instruction; let her not go, for she is thy life."

There can be little question that the action of the general court received its impulse and direction from the clergy, men of eminent qualities and of well-deserved authority. Among

the Massachusetts Bay colonists the proportion of ministers trained at Oxford and Cambridge was surprisingly large, and if we may trust the evidence of contemporary secular literature, such men as Higginson, Cotton, Wilson, Norton, Shepard, Buikley, Davenport, to mention no more, were in learning, intelligence, and general accomplishment far above the average parson of the country and the church from which their consciences had driven them out.

The presence and influence of such men were of inestimable consequence to the fortunes of the colony. If they were narrow, it was as the sword of righteousness was narrow. If they had but one idea it was as the leader of a forlorn hope had but one and can have no other—namely, to do the duty that is laid on him and ask no questions.

Our Puritan ancestors have been misrepresented and maligned by persons without imagination enough to make themselves contemporary with, and therefore able to understand, the men whose memories they strive to blacken. That happy breed of men who both in church and state led our first emigration were children of the most splendid intellectual epoch that England has ever known. They were the coevals of a generation which passed on, in scarcely a diminished radiance, the torch of life kindled in great Eliza's golden days. Out of the new learning, the new ferment, alike religious and national, and the new discoveries with their suggestion of boundless possibility, the alembic of that age had distilled a potent elixir either inspiring or intoxicating, as the mind that imbibed it was strong or weak.

Are we to suppose that the lips of the founders of New England alone were unwetted by a drop of that stimulating draught? That Milton was the only Puritan that had read Shakespeare and Ben Johnson and Beaumont and Fletcher?

I do not believe it, whoever may. Communities as well as men have a right to be judged by their best. We are justified in taking the elder Winthrop as a type of the leading emigrants, and the more we know him the more we learn to reverence his great qualities, whether of mind or character. The posterity of those earnest and single-minded men may have thrown the creed of their fathers into the waste basket, but their fidelity to it and to the duties they believed it to involve is the most precious and potent drop in their transmitted blood. It is especially noteworthy that they did not make a strait-waistcoat of this creed for their new college. The more I meditate upon them the more I am inclined to pardon the enthusiasm of our old historian when he said that God had sifted three kingdoms to plant New England.

The Massachusetts Bay colony itself also was then, and since, without a parallel. It was established by a commercial company whose members combined in themselves the two by no means incongruous elements, enthusiasm and business sagacity, the earthy ingredient, as in dynamite, holding in check its explosive partner, which yet could and did explode on sufficient concussion. They meant that their venture should be gainful, but at the same time believed that nothing could be longer profitable for the body wherein the soul found not also her advantage. They feared God, and kept their powder dry because they feared him, and meant that others should.

I think their most remarkable characteristic was their public spirit, and in nothing did they show both that and the wise forecast that gives it its best value more clearly than when they resolved to keep the higher education of youth in their own hands and under their own eye. This they provided for in the college. Eleven years later they established

their system of public schools, where reading and writing should be taught. This they did partly, no doubt, to provide feeders for the more advanced schools, and so for the college, but even more, it may safely be inferred, because they had found that the policy to which their ends, rough-hew them as they might, must be shaped by the conditions under which they were forced to act, could be safe only in the hands of intelligent men, or, at worst, of men to whom they had given a chance to become such.

One is sometimes tempted to think that all learning is as repulsive to ingenuous youth as the multiplication table to Scott's little friend, Marjorie Fleming, though this is due in great part to mechanical methods of teaching.

"I am now going to tell you," she writes, "the horrible and wretched plague that my multiplication table gives me; you can't conceive it; the most devilish thing is eight times eight and seven times seven; it is what nature itself can't endure."

I know that I am approaching treacherous ashes which cover burning coals, but I must on. Is not Greek, nay, even Latin, yet more unendurable than poor Marjorie's task? How many boys have not sympathized with Heine in hating the Romans because they invented Latin grammar? And they were quite right, for we begin the study of languages at the wrong end, at the end which nature does not offer us, and are thoroughly tired of them before we arrive at them, if you will pardon the bull. But is that any reason for not studying them in the right way?

I am familiar with the arguments for making the study of Greek especially a matter of choice or chance. I admit their plausibility and the honesty of those who urge them. I should be willing, also, to admit that the study of the ancient

languages without the hope or the prospect of going on to what they contain would be useful only as a form of intellectual gymnastics. Even so they would be as serviceable as the higher mathematics to most of us. But I think that a wise teacher should adapt his tasks to the highest and not the lowest capacities of the taught.

For those lower, also, they would not be wholly without profit. When there is a tedious sermon, says George Herbert,

"God takes a text, and teacheth patience,"

not the least pregnant of lessons. One of the arguments against the compulsory study of Greek, namely, that it is wiser to give our time to modern languages and modern history than to dead languages and ancient history, involves, I think, a verbal fallacy. Only those languages can properly be called dead in which nothing living has been written. If the classic languages are dead they yet speak to us and with a clearer voice than that of any living tongue.

If their language is dead, yet the literature it enshrines is crammed with life as, perhaps, no other writing except Shakespeare's ever was or will be. It is as contemporary with to-day as with the ears it first enraptured, for it appeals not to the man of then or now, but to the entire round of human nature itself. Men are ephemeral or evanescent, but whatever badge the authentic soul of man has touched with her immortalizing finger, no matter how long ago, is still young and fair as it was to the world's gray father's. Oblivion looks in the face of the Grecian muse only to forget her purpose. Even for the mastering of our own tongue there is no expedient so truthful as translation out of another; how much more when that other is a language at once so precise

and so flexible as the Greek! Greek literature is also the most fruitful comment on our own. Coleridge has told us with what profit he was made to study Shakespeare and Milton in conjunction with the Greek dramatists. It is no sentimental argument for this study that the most justly balanced, the most serene and the most fecundating minds since the revival of learning have been saturated with Greek literature. We know not whether other studies will lead us, especially if dissociated from this; we do not know to what summits, far above our lower region of turmoil, this has led, and what the many-sided outlook thence.

Will such studies make anachronisms of us? Unfit us for the duties and the business of to-day? I can recall no writer more truly modern than Montaigne, who was almost more at home in Athens and Rome than in Paris. Yet he was a thrifty manager of his estate and a most competent mayor of Bordeaux.

I remember passing once in London where demolition for a new thoroughfare was going on. Many houses left standing in the rear of those cleared away bore signs with the inscription "Ancient Lights." This was the protest of their owners against being built out by the new improvements from such glimpse of heaven as their fathers had, without adequate equivalent. I laid the moral to heart.

I am speaking of the college as it has always existed and still exists. In so far as it may be driven to put on the forms of the university—I do not mean the four faculties merely, but in the modern sense—we shall naturally find ourselves compelled to assume the method with the function. Some day we shall offer here a chance, at least, to acquire the *omne scibile*. I shall be glad, as shall we all, when the young American need no longer go abroad for any part of his train-

ing, though that may not be always a disadvantage, if Shakespeare was right in thinking that—

“Home-keeping youths have ever homely wits.”

I should be still gladder if Harvard should be the place that offered the alternative. It seems more than ever probable that this will happen, and happen in our day.

And whenever this consummation is accomplished it will be due, more than to any and all others, to the able, energetic, and simple-minded man who has presided over the college during the trying period of transition, and who by a rare combination of eminent qualities, will carry that transition to its fulfilment without haste and without jar. “*Ohne Hast, ohne Rast.*” He more than any of his distinguished predecessors, has brought the university into closer and more telling relations with the national life in whatever that life has which is most distinctive, most excellent, and most hopeful.

But we still mainly occupy the position of a German gymnasium. Under existing circumstances therefore, and with the methods of teaching they enforce, I think that special and advanced courses should be pushed on, as the other professional courses are, into the post-graduate period. The opportunity would be greater because the number would be less, and the teaching not only more thorough but more vivifying through the more intimate relation of teacher and pupil. Under those conditions the voluntary system will not only be possible, but will come of itself, for every student will know what he wants and where he may get it, and learning will be loved as it should be, for its own sake as well as for what it gives.

The friends of university training can do nothing that

would forward it more than the founding of post-graduate fellowships and the building and endowing of a hall where the holders of them might be commensals, remembering that when Cardinal Wolsey built Christ Church at Oxford his first care was the kitchen. Nothing is so great a quickener of the faculties or so likely to prevent their being narrowed to a single groove as the frequent social commingling of men who are aiming at one goal by different paths: If you would have really great scholars, and our life offers no prize for such, it would be well if the university could offer them. I have often been struck with the many-sided versatility of the fellows of the English colleges who have kept their wits in training by continual fencing with one another.

During the first two centuries of her existence it may be affirmed that Harvard did sufficiently well the only work she was called on to do, perhaps the only work it was possible for her to do. She gave to Boston her scholarly impress, to the Commonwealth her scholastic impulse. To the clergy of her training was mainly intrusted the oversight of the public schools; these were, as I have said, though indirectly, feeders of the college, for their teaching was the plainest.

But if a boy in any country village showed uncommon parts the clergyman was sure to hear of it. He and the squire and the doctor, if there was one, talked it over and the boy was sure to be helped onward to college, for next to the five points of Calvinism, our ancestors believed in a college education; that is, in the best education that was to be had. The system, if system it should be called, was a good one, a practical application of the doctrine of natural selection. Ah! how the parents, nay, the whole family toiled and pinched that this boy might have the chance denied to them.

Mr. Matthew Arnold has told us that in contemporary

France, which seems doomed to try every theory of enlightenment by which the fingers may be burned or the house set on fire, the children of the public schools are taught in answer to the question, "Who gives you all these fine things?" to say, "The State."

Ill fares the State in which the parental image is replaced by an abstraction. The answer of the boy of whom I have been speaking would have been in a spirit better for the State and for the hope of his own future life: "I owe them under God to my own industry, to the sacrifices of my father and mother and to the sympathy of good men." Nor was the boy's self-respect lessened, for the aid was given by loans to be repaid when possible. The times have changed, and it is no longer the ambition of a promising boy to go to college. They are taught to think that a common school education is good enough for all practical purposes; and so perhaps it is, but not for all ideal purposes. Our public schools teach too little or too much; too little, if education is to go no further; too many things if what is taught is to be taught thoroughly. And the more they seem to teach the less likely is education to go further, for it is one of the prime weaknesses of a democracy to be satisfied with the second best if it appear to answer the purpose tolerably well, and to be cheaper—as it never is in the long run.

Harvard has done much, by raising its standard, to force upward that also of the preparatory schools. The leaven thus infused will, let us hope, filter gradually downward till it raise a ferment in the lower grades as well. What we need more than anything else is to increase the number of our highly cultivated men and thoroughly trained minds, for these, wherever they go, are sure to carry with them, consciously or not, the seeds of sounder thinking and of higher

ideals. The only way in which our civilization can be maintained, even at the level it has reached; the only way in which that level can be made more general and be raised higher, is by bringing the influence of the more cultivated to bear with more energy and directness on the less cultivated and by opening more inlets to those indirect influences which make for refinement of mind and body.

Democracy must show its capacity for producing, not a higher average man, but the highest possible types of manhood in all its manifold varieties, or it is a failure. No matter what it does for the body, if it do not in some sort satisfy that inextinguishable passion of the soul for something that lifts life away from prose, from the common and the vulgar, it is a failure. Unless it know how to make itself gracious and winning, it is a failure. Has it done this? Is it doing this? Or trying to do it?

Not yet, I think, if one may judge by that commonplace of our newspapers that an American who stays long enough in Europe is sure to find his own country unendurable when he comes back. This is not true, if I may judge from some little experience, but it is interesting as implying a certain consciousness, which is of the most hopeful augury. But we must not be impatient; it is a far cry from the dwellers in caves to even such civilization as we have achieved. I am conscious that life has been trying to civilize me for now nearly seventy years with what seem to me very inadequate results. We cannot afford to wait but the race can. And when I speak of civilization I mean those things that tend to develop the moral forces of man and not merely to quicken his æsthetic sensibility, though there is often a nearer relation between the two than is popularly believed.

The tendency of a prosperous democracy—and hitherto

we have had little to do but prosper—is toward an overweening confidence in itself and its home-made methods, an overestimate of material success and a corresponding indifference to the things of the mind. The popular ideal of success seems to be more than ever before the accumulation of riches. I say “seems,” for it may be only because the opportunities are greater.

I am not ignorant that wealth is the great fertilizer of civilization and of the arts that beautify it. The very names of civilization and politeness show that the refinement of manners which made the arts possible is the birth of cities where wealth earliest accumulated because it found itself secure. Wealth may be an excellent thing, for it means power, it means leisure, it means liberty.

But these, divorced from culture, that is, from intelligent purpose, become the very mockery of their own essence, not goods but evils fatal to their possessor, and bring with them like the Nibelung hoard a doom instead of a blessing. I am saddened when I see our success as a nation measured by the number of acres under tillage or of bushels of wheat exported, for the real value of a country must be weighed in scales more delicately than the balance of trade. The gardens of Sicily are empty now, but the bees from all climes still fetch honey from the tiny garden plot of Theocritus. On a map of the world you may cover Judea with your thumb, Athens with a finger tip, and neither of them figures in the prices current, but they still lord it in the thought and action of every civilized man. Did not Dante cover with his hood all that was Italy six hundred years ago? And if we go back a century, where was Germany unless in Weimar?

Material success is good but only as the necessary preliminary of better things. The measure of a nation's true suc-

cess is the amount it has contributed to the thought, the moral energy, the intellectual happiness, the spiritual hope and consolation of mankind. There is no other, let our candidates flatter us as they may. We still make a confusion between huge and great. I know that I am repeating truisms but they are truisms that need to be repeated in season and out of season.

The most precious property of culture and of a college as its trustee is to maintain high ideals of life and its purpose, to keep trimmed and burning the lamps of that Pharos built by wiser than we which warps from the reefs and shallows of popular doctrine. In proportion as there are more thoroughly cultivated persons in a community will the finer uses of prosperity be taught and the vulgar uses of it become disreputable.

And it is such persons that we are commissioned to send out with such consciousness of their fortunate vocation and such devotion to it as we may. We are confronted with unexpected problems. First of all is democracy, and that under conditions in great part novel, with its hitherto imperfectly tabulated results, whether we consider its effects upon national character, on popular thought, or on the functions of law and government.

We have to deal with a time when the belief seems to be spreading that truth not only can but should be settled by a show of hands rather than by a count of heads, and that one man is as good as another for all purposes—as indeed he is till a real man is needed; with a time when the press is more potent for good or for evil than ever any human agency was before, and yet is controlled more than ever before by its interests as a business than by its sense of duty as a teacher, giving news instead of intelligence; with a time when divers

and strange doctrines touching the greatest human interests are allowed to run about unmuzzled in greater number and variety than ever before since the Reformation passed into its stage of putrefactive fermentation; with a time when the idols of the market-place are more devoutly worshipped than ever Diana of the Ephesians was; when the electric telegraph by making public opinion simultaneous is also making it liable to those delusions, panics, and gregarious impulses which transform otherwise reasonable men into a mob, and when above all the better mind of the country is said to be growing more and more alienated from the highest of all sciences and services, the government of it.

I have drawn up a dreary catalogue and the moral it points is this—that the college in so far as it continues to be still a college, as in great part it does and must, is and should be limited by pre-existing conditions, and must consider first what the more general objects of education are without neglecting special aptitudes more than cannot be helped.

That more general purpose is, I take it, to set free, to supple and train the faculties in such wise as shall make them most effective for whatever task life may afterward set them, for the duties of life rather than for its business, and to open windows on every side of the mind where thickness of wall does not prevent it. Let our aim be as hitherto to give a good all-round education, fitted to cope with as many exigencies of the day as possible. I had rather the college should turn out one of Aristotle's four-square men, capable of holding his own in whatever field he may be cast, than a score of lopsided ones developed abnormally in one direction.

Our scheme should be adapted to the wants of the majority of undergraduates, to the objects that drew them hither, and to such training as will make the most of them after they

come. Special aptitudes are sure to take care of themselves, but the latent possibilities of the average mind can only be discovered by experiment in many directions.

When I speak of the average mind I do not mean that the courses of study should be adapted to the average level of intelligence but to the highest, for in these matters it is wiser to grade upward than downward since the best is the only thing that is good enough. To keep the wing-footed down to the pace of the leaden-soled disheartens the one without in the least encouraging the other.

“Brains,” says Machiavelli, are “of three generations, those that understand of themselves, those that understand when another shows them, and those that understand neither of themselves nor by the showing of others.”

It is the first class that should set the stint; the second will get on better than if they had set it themselves, and the third will at least have the pleasure of seeing the others show their paces.

In the college proper I repeat, for it is the birthday of the college that we are celebrating, it is the college that we love and of which we are proud—let it continue to give such a training as will fit the rich to be trusted with riches and the poor to withstand the temptations of poverty. Give to history, give to political economy, the ample verge the times demand, but with no detriment to those liberal arts which have formed open-minded men and good citizens in the past nor have lost the skill to form them.

Let it be our hope to make a gentleman of every youth who is put under our charge, not a conventional gentleman but a man of culture, a man of intellectual resource, a man of public spirit, a man of refinement, with that good taste which is the conscience of the mind and that conscience which is the

good taste of the soul. This we have tried to do in the past; this let us try to do in the future. We cannot do this for all at best; perhaps only for the few; but the influence for good of a highly trained intelligence and a harmoniously developed character is incalculable, for though it be subtle and gradual in its operation, it is as pervasive as it is subtle. There may be few of these—there must be few—but

“ That few is all the world which with a few  
Doth ever live and move and work and stirre.”

They who, on a tiny clearing pared from the edge of the woods built here, most probably from the timber hewed from the trees they felled, our earliest hall, with the solitude of ocean behind them, the mystery of forest before them, and all about them a desolation, must surely (*si quis animis celestibus locus*) share our gladness and our gratitude at the splendid fulfilment of their vision. If we could have but preserved the humble roof which housed so great a future, Mr. Ruskin himself would almost have admitted that no castle or cathedral was ever richer in sacred associations, in pathos of the past and in moral significance.

They who reared it had the sublime presence of that courage which fears only God, and could say confidently, in the face of all discouragement and doubt, “ He hath led us forth into a large place; because he delighted in me he hath delivered me.” We cannot honor them too much; we can repay them only by showing, as occasions rise, that we do not undervalue the worth of their example.

Brethren of the alumni, it now becomes my duty to welcome in your name the guests who have come, some of them so far, to share our congratulations and hopes to-day. I cannot name them all and give to each his fitting phrase. Thrice welcome to them all, and as is fitting, first to those

from abroad, representatives of illustrious universities that were old in usefulness and fame when ours was in its cradle, and next, to those of our own land from colleges and universities which, if not daughters of Harvard are young enough to be so, and are one with her in heart and hope. I said that I should single out none by name, but I should not represent you fitly if I gave no special greeting to the gentleman who brings the message of John Harvard's College Emmanuel. The welcome we give him could not be warmer than that which we offer to his colleagues, but we cannot help feeling that in pressing his hand our own instinctively closes a little more tightly as with a sense of nearer kindred. There is also one other name of which it would be indecorous not to make an exception. You all know that I can mean only the President of our country. His presence is a signal honor to us all, and to us all I may say a personal gratification. We have no politics here, but the sons of Harvard all belong to the party which admires courage, strength of purpose and fidelity to duty, and which respects, wherever he may be found, the—

“*Justum et tenacem propositi virum,*”<sup>1</sup>

who knows how to withstand the

“*Civium ardor prava jubentium.*”<sup>2</sup>

He has left the helm of State to be with us here, and so long as it is intrusted to his hands we are sure that, should the storm come, he will say with Seneca's pilot, “O, Neptune, you may save me if you will; you may sink me if you will; but whatever happen, I shall keep my rudder true.”

---

<sup>1</sup> The man who is upright and tenacious of his purpose.

<sup>2</sup> The evil zeal of clamorous citizens.

## A PLEA FOR THE MODERN LANGUAGES

[An address delivered in Cambridge, Mass., at the Seventh Annual Convention of the Modern Language Association, December, 1889.]

THREE years ago I was one of those who gathered in the Sanders Theatre to commemorate the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of a college founded to perpetuate living learning chiefly by the help of three dead languages, the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin. I have given them that order of precedence which they had in the minds of those our pious founders.

The Hebrew came first because they believed that it had been spoken by God himself, and that it would have been the common speech of mankind but for the judicial invention of the modern languages at Shinar. Greek came next because the New Testament was written in that tongue, and Latin last as the interpreter between scholars. Of the men who stood about that fateful cradle, swung from bough of the primeval forest, there were probably few who believed that a book written in any living language could itself live.

For nearly two hundred years no modern language was continuously and systematically taught here. In the latter half of the last century a stray Frenchman was caught now and then and kept as long as he could endure the baiting of his pupils. After failing as a teacher of his mother tongue, he commonly turned dancing-master, a calling which public opinion seems to have put on the same intellectual level with the other. Whatever haphazard teaching of French there may have been was, no doubt, for the benefit of those youth of the better classes who might go abroad after taking their degrees.

By hook or by crook some enthusiasts managed to learn German, but there was no official teacher before Dr. Follen, about sixty years ago. When at last a chair of French and Spanish was established here, it was rather with an eye to commerce than to culture. It indicates a very remarkable, and, I think, wholesome change in our way of looking at things that I should now be addressing a numerous society composed wholly of men engaged in teaching thoroughly and scientifically the very languages once deemed unworthy to be taught at all except as a social accomplishment or as a commercial subsidiary. There are now I believe as many teachers in that single department of Harvard College as sufficed for the entire undergraduate course when I took my first degree. And this change has taken place within two generations.

*Tῶ δ' ἡδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρωπῶν  
'Εθαθ.*<sup>1</sup>

I make this familiar quotation for two reasons: because Chapman translates *μερόπων* "divers-languaged," which is apt for our occasion, and because it enables me to make an easier transition to what I am about to say, namely, that I rise to address you not without a certain feeling of embarrassment. For every man is, more or less consciously, the prisoner of his date, and I must confess that I was a great while in emancipating myself from the formula which prescribed the Greek and Latin classics as the canonical books of that infallible Church of Culture outside of which there could be no salvation, none, at least, that was orthodox. Indeed I am not sure that I have wholly emancipated myself even yet. The old phrases (for mere phrases they had mostly come to be)

---

<sup>1</sup>Already two generations of speaking men have passed away.

still sing in my ears with a pleasing if not a prevailing enchantment.

The traditions which had dictated this formula were of long standing and of eminent respectability. They dated back to the *exemplaria Græca* of Horace. For centuries the languages which served men for all the occasions of private life were put under a ban, and the revival of learning extended this outlawry to the literature, such as it was, that had found vent through them. Even the authors of that literature tacitly admitted the justice of such condemnation when they used the word "Latin" as meaning language *par excellence*, just as the Newfoundlanders say "fish" when they mean cod.

They could be witty, eloquent, pathetic, poetical, competent, in a word, to every demand of their daily lives, in their mother tongue, as the Greeks and Romans had been in theirs but all this would not do; what was so embalmed would not keep.

All the prudent and forethoughtful among them accordingly were careful to put their thoughts and fancies, or what with them supplied the place of these commodities, into Latin as the one infallible pickle. They forgot the salt, to be sure, an ingredient which the author alone can furnish. For it is not the language in which a man writes, but what he has been able to make that language say or sing, that resists decay. Yet men were naturally a great while in reaching this conviction. They thought it was not good form, as the phrase is, to be pleased with what, and what alone, really touched them home. The reproach, *at vestri proavi*,<sup>1</sup> rang deterrent in their ears. The author of "Partonopeus de Blois," it is true, plucks up a proper spirit:

---

<sup>1</sup> Ah, but your ancestors!

“ Cil clerc dient que n'est pas sens  
 Qu' escrive estoire d'antif tens,  
 Quant je nes escris en latin,  
 Et que je perc mon tans enfin;  
 Cil le perdent qui ne font rien  
 Moult plus que je ne fac le mien.”<sup>1</sup>

And the sarcasm of the last couplet was more biting even than the author thought it. Those moderns who wrote in Latin truly *ne faiseient rien* for I cannot recollect any work of the kind that has in any sense survived as literature unless it be the “ *Epistolae Obscuroram Virorum* ” (whose Latin is a part of its humor) and a few short copies of verse, as they used, aptly enough, to be called.

You all remember du Bellay's eloquent protest, “ I cannot sufficiently blame the foolish arrogance and temerity of some of our nation, who, being least of all Greeks or Latins, deprecate and reject with a more than stoic brow everything written in French, and I cannot sufficiently wonder at the strange opinion of some learned men who think our vernacular incapable of all good literature and erudition.”

When this was said, Montaigne was already sixteen years old and, not to speak of the great mass of verse and prose then dormant in manuscript, France had produced in Rabelais a great humorist and strangely open-eyed thinker, and in Villon, a poet who had written at least one immortal poem which still touches us with that painless sense of the *lachrymæ rerum* so consoling in poetry and the burthen of which

“ Ou sont les neiges d'antan? ”<sup>2</sup>

falters and fades away in the ear like the last stroke of Beauty's passing bell. I must not let you forget that du Bel-

<sup>1</sup> These pedants declare that there is no sense in writing the history of ancient times unless I write in Latin and that I am in fact wasting my time. Such men waste their time doing nothing far more than I waste mine.

<sup>2</sup> “ Where are the snows of yore? ”

lay had formed himself on the classics, and that he insists on the assiduous study of them. "Devour them," he says, "not in order to imitate, but to turn them into blood and nutriment." And surely this always has been and always will be their true use.

It was not long before the living languages justified their right to exist by producing a living literature, but as the knowledge of Greek and Latin was the exclusive privilege of a class, that class naturally made an obstinate defence of its vested rights. Nor was it less natural that men like Bacon, who felt that he was speaking to the civilized world, and lesser men who fancied themselves charged with a pressing message to it, should choose to utter themselves in the only tongue that was cosmopolitan. But already such books as had more than a provincial meaning though written in what the learned still looked on as *patois*, were beginning to be translated into the other European languages.

The invention of printing had insensibly but surely enlarged the audience which genius addresses. That there were persons in England who had learned something of French, Italian, Spanish, and of High and Low Dutch three centuries ago is shown by the dramatists of the day, but the speech of the foreigner was still generally regarded as something noxious. Later generations shared the prejudice of sturdy Abbot Samson who confirmed the manor of Thorpe "cuidam Anglico natione . . . de cuius fidelitate plenius confidebat quia bonus agricola erat et quia nesciebat loqui Gallice."<sup>1</sup> This was in 1182, but there is a still more amusing instance of the same prejudice so lately as 1668.

---

<sup>1</sup>"To a certain Englishman in whose trustworthiness he had fuller confidence because he was a good farmer and because he could not speak French."

“Erasmus hath also a notable story of a man of the same age, an Italian, that had never been in Germany, and yet he spake the German tongue most elegantly, being as one possessed of the Devil; notwithstanding was cured by a physician that administered a medicine which expelled an infinite number of *worms*, whereby *he was also freed of his knowledge of the German tongue.*” Dr. Ramesey seems in doubt whether the vermin or the language were the greater deliverance.

Even after it could no longer be maintained that no masterpiece could be written in a modern language, it was affirmed, and on very plausible grounds, that no masterpiece of style could be so written unless after sedulous study of the ancient and especially of the Grecian models. This may have been partially, but was it entirely true? Were those elements of the human mind which tease it with the longing for perfection in literary workmanship peculiar to the Greeks?

Before the new birth of letters Dante (though the general scheme of his great poem be rather mechanical than organic) had given proof of a style, which where it is best is so parsimonious in the number of its words, so goldenly sufficient in the value of them, that we must go back to Tacitus for a comparison, and perhaps not even to him for a parallel. But Dante was a great genius, and language courtesies to its natural kings.

I will take a humbler instance, the “chant-fable” of *Aucassin and Nicolette* rippling into song and subsiding from it unconsciously as a brook. Leaving out the episode of the King of Torelore, evidently thrust in for the groundlings, what is there like it for that unpremeditated charm which is beyond the reach of literary artifice and perhaps does not survive the early maidenhood of language? If this be not style then there is something better than style. And is there

anything so like the best epigrams of Meleager in grace of natural feeling, in the fine tact which says all and leaves it said unblurred by afterthought, as some little snatches of song by nameless French minstrels of five centuries ago?

It is instructive that only fifty years after du Bellay wrote the passage I have quoted, Bishop Hall was indirectly praising Sidney for having learned in France and brought back with him to England that very specialty of culture which we are told can only be got in ancient Greece, or at second hand in ancient Rome. Speaking of some nameless rhymers, he says of him that

"He knows the grace of that new elegance  
Which sweet Phillisides fetched late from France."

And did not Spenser (whose earliest essay in verse seems to have been translated from du Bellay) form himself on French and Italian models? Did not Chaucer and Gower, the shapers of our tongue, draw from the same sources? Does not Higgins tell us in the "Mirrour for Magistrates" that Buckhurst, Phaer, Tuberville, Golding, and Gascoygne imitated Marot? Did not Montaigne prompt Bacon to his Essays and Browne (unconsciously and indirectly it may be) to his "Religio Medici?" Did not Skelton borrow his so-called Skeltonian measure from France? Is not the verse of "Paradise Lost" moulded on that of the "Divina Commedia?" Did not Dryden's prose and Pope's verse profit by Parisian example?

Nay, in our own time is it not whispered that more than one of our masters of style in English, and they, too, among the chief apostles of classic culture, owe more of this mastery to Paris than to Athens or Rome? I am not going to renew the Battle of the Books, nor would I be understood as questioning the rightful place so long held by ancient and especi-

ally by Greek literature as an element of culture and that the most fruitful. But I hold this evening a brief for the modern languages and am bound to put their case in as fair a light as I conscientiously can. Your kindness has put me in a position where I am forced to reconsider my opinions and to discover, if I can, how far prejudice and tradition have had a hand in forming them.

I will not say with the Emperor Charles V, that a man is as many men as he knows languages, and still less with Lord Burleigh that such polyglottism is but “to have one meat served in divers dishes.”

But I think that to know the literature of another language, whether dead or living matters not, gives us the prime benefits of foreign travel. It relieves us from what Richard Lassels aptly calls, a “Moral Excommunication;” it greatly widens the mind’s range of view, and therefore of comparison, thus strengthening the judicial faculty; and it teaches us to consider the relations of things to each other and to some general scheme rather than to ourselves; above all it enlarges æsthetic charity.

It has seemed to me also that a foreign language, quite as much as a dead one, has the advantage of putting whatever is written in it at just such a distance as is needed for a proper mental perspective. No doubt this strangeness, this novelty, adds much to the pleasure we feel in reading the literature of other languages than our own. It plays the part of poet for us by putting familiar things in an unaccustomed way so deftly that we feel as if we had gained another sense and had ourselves a share in the sorcery that is practised on us. The words of our mother tongue have been worn smooth by so often rubbing against our lips or minds, while the alien word has all the subtle emphasis and beauty of some

new minted coin of ancient Syracuse. In our critical estimates we should be on our guard against this charm.

In reading such books as chiefly deserve to be read in any foreign language it is wise to translate consciously and in words as we read. There is no such help to a fuller mastery of our vernacular. It compels us to such a choosing and testing, to so nice a discrimination of sound, propriety, position, and shade of meaning, that we now first learn the secret of the words we have been using or misusing all our lives and are gradually made aware that to set forth even the plainest matter as it should be set forth is not only a very difficult thing calling for thought and practice, but an affair of conscience as well.

Translating teaches us as nothing else can, not only that there is a best way, but that it is the only way. Those who have tried it know too well how easy it is to grasp the verbal meaning of a sentence or of a verse. That is the bird in the hand. The real meaning, the soul of it, that which makes it literature and not jargon, that is the bird in the bush which tantalizes and stimulates with the vanishing glimpses we catch of it as it flits from one to another lurking place:

*“Et fugit ad salices et se cupid ante videri.”* After all, I am driven back to my Virgil again, you see, for the happiest expression of what I was trying to say. It was these shy allurements and provocations of Omar Khayyam’s Persian which led Fitzgerald to many a peerless phrase and made an original poet of him in the very act of translating.

I cite this instance merely by way of hint that as a spur to the mind, as an open-sesame to the treasures of our native vocabulary, the study of a living language (for literary, not linguistic ends) may serve as well as that of any which we rather inaptly call dead.

We are told that perfection of form can be learned only of the Greeks, and it is certainly true that many among them attained to, or developed out of some hereditary germ of aptitude, a sense of proportion and of the helpful relation of parts to the whole organism which other races mostly grope after in vain. Spenser, in the enthusiasm of his new Platonism tells us that "Soul is form, and doth the body make," and no doubt this is true of the highest artistic genius. Form without soul, the most obsequious observance of the unities, the most perfect *a priori* adjustment of parts, is a lifeless thing like those machines of perpetual motion, admirable in every way but one—that they will not go.

I believe that I understand and value form as much as I should, but I also believe that some of those who have insisted most strongly on its supreme worth as the shaping soul of a work of art have imprisoned the word soul in a single one of its many meanings and the soul itself in a single one of its many functions. For the soul is not only that which gives form, but that which gives life, the mysterious and pervasive essence always in itself beautiful, not always so in the shapes which it informs, but even then full of infinite suggestion.

In literature it is what we call genius, an insoluble ingredient which kindles, lights, inspires, and transmits impulsion to other minds, wakens energies in them hitherto latent and makes them startlingly aware that they too may be parts of the controlling purpose of the world.

A book may be great in other ways than as a lesson in form, and it may be for other qualities that it is most precious to us. Is it nothing, then, to have conversed with genius? Goethe's "Iphigenie" is far more perfect in form than his "Faust," which is indeed but a succession of scenes strung

together on a thread of moral or dramatic purpose, yet it is "Faust" that we read and hold dear alike for its meaning and for the delight it gives us.

And if we talk of classics, what, then, is a classic if it be not a book that forever delights, inspires, and surprises?—in which, and in ourselves, by its help, we make new discoveries every day. What book has so warmly embosomed itself in the mind and memory of men as the "Iliad?" And yet surely not by its perfection in form so much as by the stately simplicity of its style, by its pathetic truth to nature, for so loose and discursive is its plan as to have supplied plausible argument for a diversity of authorship. What work of classic antiquity has given the *bransle*, as he would have called it, to more fruitful thinking than the Essays of Montaigne, the most planless of men who ever looked before and after, a chaos indeed, but a chaos swarming with germs of evolution?

There have been men of genius, like Emerson, richly semi-native for other minds; like Browning, full of wholesome ferment for other minds, though wholly destitute of any proper sense of form. Yet perhaps those portions of their writings where their genius has precipitated itself in perfect, if detached and unrelated crystals flashing back the light of our common day tinged with the diviner hue of their own nature, are and will continue to be a more precious and fecund possession of mankind than many works more praiseworthy as wholes, but in which the vitality is less abounding, or seems so because more evenly distributed and therefore less capable of giving that electric shock which thrills through every fibre of the soul.

But Samuel Daniel, an Elizabethan poet less valued now than many an inferior man, has said something to my pur-

pose far better than I could have said it. Nor is he a suspicious witness, for he is himself a master of style. He had studied the art of writing, and his diction has accordingly been less obscured by time than that of most of his contemporaries. He knew his classics, too, and his dullest work is the tragedy of "Cleopatra" shaped on a classic model, presumably Seneca, certainly not the best. But he had modern instincts, and a conviction that the later generations of men had also their rights, among others that of speaking their minds in such forms as were most congenial to them. In answer to some one who had denounced the use of rhyme as barbarous, he wrote his "Defence of Rhyme," a monument of noble and yet impassioned prose.

In this he says, "Suffer the world to enjoy that which it knows and what it likes, seeing whatsoever form of words doth move delight, and sway the affections of men, in what Scythian sort soever it be disposed and uttered, that is true number, measure, eloquence, and the perfection of speech."

I think that Daniel's instinct guided him to a half-truth, which he as usual believed to include the other half also. For I have observed that truth is the only object of man's ardent pursuit of which every one is convinced that he and he alone has got the whole.

I am not sure that form, which is the artistic sense of decorum controlling the co-ordination of parts and ensuring their harmonious subservience to a common end, can be learned at all, whether of the Greeks or elsewhere. I am not sure that even style (a lower form of the same faculty or quality, whichever it be), which has to do with the perfection of the parts themselves, and whose triumph it is to produce the greatest effect with the last possible expenditure

of material,—I am not sure that even this can be taught in any school.

If Sterne had been asked where he got that style which, when he lets it alone, is as perfect as any that I know; if Goldsmith had been asked where he got his, so equable, so easy without being unduly familiar, might they not have answered with the maiden in the ballad,

“I gat it in my mither’s wame,  
Where ye’ll get never the like”?

But even though the susceptibility of art must be inborn, yet skill in the practical application of it to use may be increased,—best by practice, and very far next best by example. Assuming, however, that either form or style is to be had without the intervention of our good fairy, we can get them, or at least a wholesome misgiving that they exist and are of serious import, from the French, as Sir Philip Sidney and so many others have done, as not a few are doing now. It is for other and greater virtues that I would frequent the Greeks.

Browning, in the preface to his translation of the “Agamemnon,” says bluntly, as is his wont, “learning Greek teaches Greek and nothing else.” One is sometimes tempted to think that it teaches some other language far harder than Greek when one tries to read his translation.

Matthew Arnold, on the other hand, was never weary of insisting that the *grand style* could be best learned of the Greeks, if not of them only. I think it may be taught, or, at least, fruitfully suggested, in other ways. Thirty odd years ago I brought home with me from Nuremberg photographs of Peter Fischer’s statues of the twelve apostles. These I used to show to my pupils and ask for a guess at their size.

The invariable answer was "larger than life." They were really about eighteen inches high, and this grandiose effect was wrought by simplicity of treatment, dignity of pose, a large unfretted sweep of drapery. This object-lesson I found more telling than much argument and exhortation. I am glad that Arnold should have been so insistent, he said so many admirable things in maintaining his thesis. But I question the validity of single verses, or even of three or four, as examples of style, whether grand or other, and I think he would have made an opponent very uncomfortable who should have ventured to discuss Homer with as little knowledge of Greek as he himself apparently had of Old French when he commented on the "*Chanson de Roland*."

He cites a passage from the poem and gives in a note an English version of it which is translated, not from the original, but from the French rendering by Génin who was himself on no very intimate terms with the archaisms of his mother tongue. With what he says of the poem I have little fault to find. It is said with his usual urbane discretion and marked by his usual steadiness of insight.

But I must protest when he quotes four lines, apt as they are for his purpose, as an adequate sample, and then compares them with a most musically pathetic passage from Homer. Who is there that could escape undiminished from such a comparison? Nor do I think that he appreciated as he should one quality of the poem which is essentially Homeric, I mean its invigorating energy, the exhilaration of manhood and courage that exhales from it, the same that Sidney felt in "*Chevy Chase*."

I believe we should judge a book rather by its total effect than by the adequacy of special parts, and is not this effect

moral as well as æsthetic? If we speak of style, surely that is like good breeding, not fortuitous, but characteristic, the key which gives the pitch of the whole tune. If I should set some of the epithets with which Achilles lays Agamemnon about the ears in the first book of the "Iliad" in contrast with the dispute between Roland and Oliver about blowing the olifaunt, I am not sure that Homer would win the prize of higher breeding.

The "Chanson de Roland" is to me a very interesting and inspiring poem, certainly not to be named with the "Iliad" for purely literary charm, but equipped with the same moral qualities that have made that poem dearer to mankind than any other. When I am "moved more than with a trumpet," I care not greatly whether it be blown by Greek or Norman breath.

And this brings me back to the application of what I quoted just now from Daniel. There seems to be a tendency of late to value literature and even poetry, for their usefulness as courses of moral philosophy or metaphysics, or as exercises to put and keep the mental muscles in training. Perhaps the highest praise of a book is that it sets us thinking, but surely the next highest praise is that it ransoms us from thought. Milton tells us that he thought Spenser "a better teacher than Scotus or Aquinas," but did he prize him less that he lectured in a garden of Alcina?

To give pleasure merely is one, and not the lowest, function of whatever deserves to be called literature. Culture, which means the opening and refining of the faculties, is an excellent thing, perhaps the best, but there are other things to be had of the muses which are also good in their kind. Refined pleasure is refining pleasure too, and teaches something in her way though she be no proper schooldame. In

my weaker moments I revert with a sigh, half depreciation, half relief, to the old notion of literature as holiday, as

“The world’s sweet inn from care and wearisome turmoil.”

Shall I make the ignominious confession that I relish Skelton’s Philip Sparowe, pet of Skelton’s Maystres Jane, or parts of it, inferior though it be in form, almost as much as that more fortunate pet of Lesbia? There is a wonderful joy in it to chase away what Skelton calls *odius ennui*, though it may not thrill our intellectual sensibility like its Latin prototype.

And in this mood the modern languages add largely to our resources. It may be wrong to be happy unless in the grand style, but it is perilously agreeable. And shall we say that the literature of the last three centuries is incompetent to put a healthy strain upon the more strenuous faculties of the mind? That it does not appeal to and satisfy the mind’s loftier desires? That Dante, Machiavelli, Montaigne, Bacon, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Pascal, Calderon, Lessing, and he of Weimar in whom Carlyle and so many others have found their university, that none of these set our thinking gear in motion to as good purpose as any ancient of them all? Is it less instructive to study the growth of modern ideas than of ancient? Is the awakening of the modern world to consciousness and its first tentative, then fuller, then rapturous expression of it,

“Like the new-abashed nightingale  
That slinteth first when he beginneth sing.”

“Till the fledged notes at length forsake their nests,  
Fluttering in wanton shoals.”

less interesting or less instructive to us because it finds a readier way to our sympathy through a postern which we cannot help leaving sometimes on the latch, than through

the ceremonious portal of classical prescription? Goethe went to the root of the matter when he said, "people are always talking of the study of the ancients; yet what does this mean but apply yourself to the actual world and seek to express it, since this is what the ancients also did when they were alive?"

That "when they were *alive*" has an unconscious sarcasm in it. I am not ashamed to confess that the first stammerings of our English speech have a pathetic charm for me which I miss in the wiser and ampler utterances of a tongue, not only foreign to me as modern languages are foreign, but thickened in its more delicate articulations by the palsying touch of time. And from the native wood notes of many modern lands, from what it was once the fashion to call the rude beginnings of their literature, my fancy carries away, I find, something as precious as Greek or Latin could have made it. Where shall I find the piteous and irreparable poverty of the parvenu so poignantly typified as in the "Lai de L'oiselet?" Where the secret password of all poetry with so haunting a memory as in Count Arnaldos,

"Yo no digo esta cancion  
Sino a quien conmigo va?"<sup>1</sup>

It is always wise to eliminate the personal equation from our judgments of literature as of other things that nearly concern us. But what is so subtle, so elusive, so inapprehensible as this *folle du logis*? Are we to be suspicious of a book's good character in proportion as it appeals more vividly to our own private consciousness and experience? How are we to know to how many it may be making the same appeal? Is there no resource, then, but to go back humbly to the old

<sup>1</sup> "I repeat this song only to whoever goes with me."

*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*,<sup>1</sup> and to accept nothing as orthodox literature on which the elder centuries have not laid their consecrating hands?

The truth is, perhaps, that in reading ancient literature many elements of false judgment, partly involved in the personal equation, are inoperative, or seem to be so, which, when we read a more nearly neighboring literature, it is well nigh impossible to neutralize. Did not a part of Matthew Arnold's preference for the verses of Homer, with the thunder-roll of which he sent poor old Thoroldus about his business, spring from a secret persuasion of their more noble harmony, their more ear-bewitching canorousness? And yet he no doubt recited these verses in a fashion which would have disqualified them as barbarously for the ear of an ancient Greek as if they had been borrowed of Thoroldus himself. Do we not see here the personal fallacy's eartip? I fancy if we could call up the old *jongleur* and bid him sing to us, accompanied by his *vieille*, we should find in his verses a plaintive and not unimpressive melody such as so strangely moves one in the untutored song of the Tuscan peasant heard afar across the sunsteeped fields with its prolonged fondling of the assonants. There is no question about what is supreme in literature. The difference between what is best and what is next best is immense; it is felt instinctively; it is a difference not of degree but of kind.

And yet may we not without lese-majesty say of books what Ferdinand says of women,

“ for several virtues  
Have I liked several women; never any  
With so full soul but some defect in her  
Did quarrel with the noblest grace she owed  
And put it to the foil ” ?

---

<sup>1</sup> The eternal, the ubiquitous, the universal.

In growing old one grows less fanatically punctual in the practice of those austerities of taste which make too constant demands on our self-denial. The ages have made up their minds about the ancients. While they are doing it about the moderns (and they are sometimes a little long about it, having the whole of time before them), may we not allow ourselves to take an honest pleasure in literature far from the highest, if you will, in point of form, not so far in point of substance, if it comply more kindly with our mood or quicken it with oppugnancy according to our need?

There are books in all modern languages which fulfil these conditions as perfectly as any, however sacred by their antiquity, can do. Were the men of the middle ages so altogether wrong in preferring Ovid because his sentiment was more in touch with their own, so that he seemed more neighborly? Or the earlier dramatists in overestimating Seneca for the same reason?

Whether it be from natural predisposition or from some occult influence of the time, there are men who find in the literature of modern Europe a stimulus and a satisfaction which Athens and Rome deny them. If these books do not give so keen an intellectual delight as the more consummate art and more musical voice of Athens enabled her to give, yet they establish and maintain, I am more than half willing to believe, more intimate and confiding relations with us.

They open new views, they liberalize us as only an acquaintance with the infinite diversity of men's minds and judgments can do, they stimulate to thought or tease the fancy with suggestion, and in short do fairly well whatever a good book is expected to do, what ancient literature did at the Revival of Learning with an effect like that which the reading of Chapman's Homer had upon Keats. And we

must not forget that the best result of this study of the ancients was the begetting of the moderns, though Dante somehow contrived to get born with no help from the Greek Hera and little more from the Roman Lucina.

As implements of education the modern books have some advantages of their own. I am told and I believe that there is a considerable number of not uningenious youths, who, whether from natural inaptitude or want of hereditary predisposition, are honestly bored by Greek and Latin, and who yet would take a wholesome and vivifying interest in what was nearer to their habitual modes of thought and association. I would not take this for granted, I would give the horse a chance at the ancient springs before I came to the conclusion that he would not drink. No doubt, the greater difficulty of the ancient languages is believed by many to be a prime recommendation of them as challenging the more strenuous qualities of the mind.

I think there are grounds for this belief, and was accordingly pleased to learn the other day that my eldest grandson was taking kindly to his Homer. I had rather he should choose Greek than any modern tongue, and I say this as a hint that I am making allowance for the personal equation. The wise gods have put difficulty between man and everything that is worth having. But where the mind is of softer fibre and less eager of emprise, may it not be prudent to open and make easy every avenue that leads to literature, even though it may not directly lead to those summits that tax the mind and muscle only to reward the climber at last with the repose of a more ethereal air?

May we not conclude that modern literature and the modern languages as the way to it should have a more important place assigned to them in our courses of instruction,

assigned to them moreover as equals in dignity, except so far as age may justly add to it, and no longer to be made to feel themselves inferior by being put below the salt?

That must depend on the way they are taught, and this on the competence and conscience of those who teach them. Already a very great advance has been made. The modern languages have nothing more of which to complain. There are nearly as many professors and assistants employed in teaching them at Harvard now as there were students of them when I was in college.

Students did I say? I meant boys who consented to spend an hour with the professor three times a week for the express purpose of evading study. Some of us learned so much that we could say "How do you do?" in several languages, and we learned little more. The real impediment was that we were kept forever in the elementary stage, that we had and could look forward to no literature that would have given significance to the languages and made them beneficent. It is very different now, and with the number of teachers the number of students has more than proportionally increased. And the reason is not far to seek. The study has been made more serious, more thorough, and therefore more inspiring.

And it is getting to be understood that as a training of the faculties, the comparative philology, at least, of the modern languages may be made as serviceable as that of the ancient. The classical superstition of the English race made them especially behindhand in this direction, and it was long our shame that we must go to the Germans to be taught the rudiments of our mother tongue.

This is no longer true. Anglo-Saxon, Gothic, Old High, and Middle High German and Icelandic are all taught not

only here, but in all our chief centres of learning. When I first became interested in Old French I made a surprising discovery. If the books which I took from the college library had been bound with gilt or yellow edges, those edges stuck together, as when so ornamented they are wont to do till the leaves have been turned. No one had ever opened those books before.

*"I was the first that ever burst  
Into that silent sea."*

Old French is now one of regular courses of instruction, and not only is the language taught but its literature as well.

Remembering what I remember, it seems to me a wonderful thing that I should have lived to see a poem in Old French edited by a young American scholar (present here this evening) and printed in the journal of this Society, a journal in every way creditable to the scholarship of the country. Nor as an illustration of the same advance in another language, should we forget Dr. Fay's admirable concordance of the "Divina Commedia."

But a more gratifying illustration than any is the existence and fruitful activity of this Association itself, and this select concourse before me which brings scholars together from all parts of the land, to stimulate them by personal commerce with men of kindred pursuits and to unite so many scattered energies in a single force controlled by a common and invigorated purpose.

We have every reason to congratulate ourselves on the progress the modern languages have made as well in academic as in popular consideration. They are not taught (as they could not formerly be taught) in a way that demands toil and thought of the student, as Greek and Latin, and they only, used to be taught; and they also open the way to higher

intellectual joys, to pastures new and not the worse for being so, as Greek and Latin, and they only, used to do.

Surely manysidedness is the very essence of culture, and it matters less what a man learns than how he learns it. The day will come, nay, it is dawning already, when it will be understood that the masterpieces of whatever language are not to be classed by an arbitrary standard, but stand on the same level in virtue of being masterpieces; that thought, imagination, and fancy may make even a *patois* acceptable to scholars; that the poets of all climes and of all ages "sing to one clear harp in divers tones," and that the masters of prose and the masters of verse in all tongues teach the same lesson and exact the same fee.

I began by saying that I had no wish to renew the Battle of the Books. I cannot bring myself to look upon the literatures of the ancient and modern worlds as antagonists, but rather as friendly rivals in the effort to tear as many as may be from the barbarizing plutolatry which seems to be so rapidly supplanting the worship of what alone is lovely and enduring. No, they are not antagonists, but by their points of disparity, of likeness, or contrast, they can be best understood, perhaps understood only through each other. The scholar must have them both, but may not he who has not leisure to be a scholar, find profit even in the lesser of the two if that only be attainable? Have I admitted that one is the lesser? "*O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*"<sup>1</sup> is perhaps what I should say here.

If I did not rejoice in the wonderful advance made in the comparative philology of the modern languages, I should not have the face to be standing here. But neither should I if I shrank from saying what I believed to be the truth, whether

---

<sup>1</sup> "More beautiful daughter of a beautiful mother."

here or elsewhere. I think that the purely linguistic side in the teaching of them seems in the way to get more than its fitting share. I insist only that in our college courses this should be a separate study, and that, good as it is in itself, it should, in the scheme of general instruction, be restrained to its own function as the guide to something better.

And that something better is literature. The blossoms of language have certainly as much value as its roots, for if the roots secrete food and thereby transmit life to the plant, yet the joyous consummation of that life is in the blossoms, which alone bear the seeds that distribute and renew it in other growths. Exercise is good for the muscles of mind and to keep it well in hand for work, but the true end of culture is to give it clay, a thing quite as needful.

What I would urge therefore is that no invidious distinction should be made between the old learning and the new, but that students, due regard being had to their temperaments and faculties, should be encouraged to take the course in modern languages as being quite as good in point of mental discipline as any other if pursued with the same thoroughness and to the same end. And that end is literature, for there language first attains to a full consciousness of its powers and to the delighted exercise of them.

Literature has escaped that doom of Shinar which made our Association possible, and still everywhere speaks in the universal tongue of civilized man. And it is only through this record of man's joys and sorrows, of his aspirations and failures, of his thought, his speculation and his dreams, that we can become complete men, and learn both what he is and what he may be, for it is the unconscious autobiography of mankind. And has no page been added to it since the last ancient classic author laid down his pen?

# EDWIN P. WHIPPLE



DWIN PERCY WHIPPLE, American essayist, critic, and lecturer, was born at Gloucester, Mass., March 8, 1819, and died at Boston, Mass., June 16, 1886. He received his education at the English High School, Salem, and for some years was employed in a broker's office at Boston, and in 1837 became superintendent of the reading-room of the Merchants' Exchange. This position he retained until 1860, when he concluded to devote himself to a literary life. When but a youth he used to write for the newspapers, and an article contributed to the "Boston Miscellany," on Macaulay, attracted attention and secured him fame. In 1843, he entered the lecture field with a series of biographical and critical addresses, afterwards published in book form under the title of "Literature and Life." He devoted himself wholly to literary work after 1860, and was for a time reviewer for the "Boston Globe." His judgments on his contemporaries were regarded as discerning as well as just. He also occasionally wrote on finance and politics, and was a personal friend of the leading authors of his day. He was engaged on a life of Governor Andrew when he died in his sixty-eighth year. Among his best-known books are, "Character and Characteristic Men" (1866); "The Literature of the Age of Elizabeth" (1869); "Success and Its Conditions" (1871). In 1887-88, selections from his writings were published under the titles, "Recollections of Eminent Men," "American Literature and Other Papers," and "Outlooks on Society, Literature, and Politics" (1888). Whipple was an able, yet not indiscriminating, literary critic. Pungent as well as true was his criticism on Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass"—that "it had every leaf except the fig leaf."

## PATRIOTIC ORATION

DELIVERED AT BOSTON, JULY 4, 1850

THE history, so sad and so glorious, which chronicles the stern struggle in which our rights and liberties passed through the awful baptism of fire and blood, is eloquent with the deeds of many patriots, warriors, and statesmen; but these all fall into relations to one prominent and commanding figure, towering up above the whole group in unapproachable majesty, whose exalted character, warm and bright with every public and

private virtue, and vital with the essential spirit of wisdom, has burst all sectional and national bounds and made the name of Washington the property of all mankind.

This illustrious man, at once the world's admiration and enigma, we are taught by a fine instinct to venerate and by a wrong opinion to misjudge. The might of his character has taken strong hold upon the feelings of great masses of men, but in translating this universal sentiment into an intelligent form, the intellectual element of this wonderful nature is as much depressed as the moral element is exalted, and consequently we are apt to misunderstand both. Mediocrity has a bad trick of idealizing itself in eulogizing him, and drags him down to its own low level while assuming to lift him to the skies. How many times have we been told that he was not a man of genius, but a person of "excellent common sense," of "admirable judgment," of "rare virtues;" and by a constant repetition of this odious cant we have nearly succeeded in divorcing comprehension from his sense, insight from his judgment, force from his virtues, and life from the man. Accordingly, in the panegyric of cold spirits, Washington disappears in a cloud of commonplaces; in the rhodomontade of boiling patriots he expires in the agonies of rant. Now the sooner this bundle of mediocre talents and moral qualities which its contrivers have the audacity to call George Washington is hissed out of existence the better it will be for the cause of talent and the cause of morals; contempt of that is the beginning of wisdom. He had no genius it seems. O no! genius we must suppose is the peculiar and shining attribute of some orator whose tongue can spout patriotic speeches, or some versifier whose muse can "Hail Columbia," but not of the man who supported states on his arm and carried America in his brain. The madcap Charles Townsend, the motion of whose pyro-

technic mind was like the whiz of a hundred rockets, is a man of genius; but George Washington raised up above the level of even eminent statesmen and with a nature moving with the still and orderly celerity of a planet round its sun,—he dwindles in comparison into a kind of angelic dunce! What is genius? Is it worth anything? Is splendid folly the measure of its inspiration? Is wisdom its base and summit,—that which it recedes from or tends toward? And by what definition do you award the name to the creator of an epic and deny it to the creator of a country? On what principle is it to be lavished on him who sculptures in perishing marble the image of possible excellence and withheld from him who built up in himself a transcendent character, indestructible as the obligations of duty and beautiful as her rewards?

Indeed, if by the genius of action you mean will enlightened by intelligence and intelligence energized by will; if force and insight be its characteristics and influence its test; and especially if great effects suppose a cause proportionably great, that is, a vital, causative mind, then is Washington most assuredly a man of genius and one whom no other American has equalled in the power of working morally and mentally on other minds. His genius it is true was of a peculiar kind, the genius of character, of thought, and the objects of thought solidified and concentrated into active faculty. He belongs to that rare class of men,—rare as Homers and Miltos, rare as Platos and Newtons,—who have impressed their characters upon nations without pampering national vices. Such men have natures broad enough to include all the facts of a people's practical life and deep enough to discern the spiritual laws which underlie, animate and govern those facts. Washington in short had that great-

ness of character which is the highest expression and last result of greatness of mind, for there is no method of building up character except through mind. Indeed, character like his is not built up, stone upon stone, precept upon precept, but grows up through an actual contact of thought with things,—the assimilative mind transmuting the impalpable but potent spirit of public sentiment, and the life of visible facts, and the power of spiritual laws, into individual life and power so that their mighty energies put on personality as it were and act through one centralizing human will. This process may not if you please make the great philosopher or the great poet but it does make the great man,—the man in whom thought and judgment seem identical with volition, the man whose vital expression is not in words but deeds, the man whose sublime ideas issue necessarily in sublime acts not in sublime art. It was because Washington's character was thus composed of the inmost substance and power of facts and principles that men instinctively felt the perfect reality of his comprehensive manhood. This reality enforced universal respect, married strength to repose, and threw into his face that commanding majesty which made men of the speculative audacity of Jefferson and the lucid genius of Hamilton recognize with unwonted meekness his awful superiority.

But you may say how does this account for Washington's virtues? Was his disinterestedness will? Was his patriotism intelligence? Was his morality genius? These questions I should answer with an emphatic yes, for there are few falser fallacies than that which represents moral conduct as flowing from moral opinions detached from moral character. Why, there is hardly a tyrant, sycophant, demagogue, or liberticide mentioned in history, who had not enough moral opinions to

suffice for a new Eden; and Shakespeare, the sure-seeing poet of human nature, delights to put the most edifying maxims of ethics into the mouths of his greatest villains, of Angelo, of Richard III, of the uncle-father of Hamlet. Without doubt Cæsar and Napoleon could have discoursed more fluently than Washington on patriotism, as there are a thousand French republicans of the last hour's coinage who could prattle more eloquently than he on freedom. But Washington's morality was built up in warring with outward temptations and inward passions, and every grace of his conscience was a trophy of toil and struggle. He had no moral opinions which hard experience and sturdy discipline had not vitalized into moral sentiments and organized into moral powers; and these powers, fixed and seated in the inmost heart of his character, were mighty and far-sighted forces which made his intelligence moral and his morality intelligent, and which no sorcery of the selfish passions could overcome or deceive. In the sublime metaphysics of the New Testament his eye was single, and this made his whole body full of light. It is just here that so many other eminent men of action, who have been tried by strong temptations, have miserably failed. Blinded by pride or whirled on by wrath they have ceased to discern and regard the inexorable moral laws, obedience to which is the condition of all permanent success; and in the labyrinths of fraud and unrealities in which crime entangles ambition, the thousand-eyed genius of wilful error is smitten with folly and madness. No human intellect however vast its compass and delicate its tact can safely thread those terrible mazes. "Every heaven-stormer," says a quaint German, "finds his hell as sure as every mountain its valley." Let us not doubt the genius of Washington because it was identical with wisdom, and because its energies worked with and

not against the spiritual order its "single eye" was gifted to divine. We commonly say that he acted in accordance with moral laws, but we must recollect that moral laws are intellectual facts, and are known through intellectual processes. We commonly say that he was so conscientious as ever to follow the path of right and obey the voice of duty. But what is right but an abstract term for rights? What is duty but an abstract term for duties? Rights and duties move not in parallel but converging lines; and how in the terror, discord, and madness of a civil war, with rights and duties in confused conflict, can a man seize on the exact point where clashing rights harmonize and where opposing duties are reconciled and act vigorously on the conception without having a conscience so informed with intelligence that his nature gravitates to the truth as by the very instinct and essence of reason?

The virtues of Washington therefore appear moral or mental according as we view them with the eye of conscience or reason. In him loftiness did not exclude breadth, but resulted from it; justice did not exclude wisdom, but grew out of it; and, as the wisest as well as justest man in America, he was pre-eminently distinguished among his contemporaries for moderation,—a word under which weak politicians conceal their want of courage, and knavish politicians their want of principle, but which in him was vital and comprehensive energy, tempering audacity with prudence, self-reliance with modesty, austere principles with merciful charities, inflexible purpose with serene courtesy, and issuing in that persistent and unconquerable fortitude in which he excelled all mankind. In scrutinizing the events of his life to discover the processes by which his character grew gradually up to its amazing height, we are arrested at the beginning by the

character of his mother, a woman temperate like him in the use of words, from her clear perception and vigorous grasp of things. There is a familiar anecdote recorded of her, which enables us to understand the simple sincerity and genuine heroism she early instilled into his strong and aspiring mind. At a time when his glory rang through Europe; when excitable enthusiasts were crossing the Atlantic for the single purpose of seeing him; when bad poets all over the world were sacking the dictionaries for hyperboles of panegyric; when the pedants of republicanism were calling him the American Cincinnatus and the American Fabius—as if our Washington were honored in playing the adjective to any Roman however illustrious!—she, in her quiet dignity, simply said to the voluble friends who were striving to flatter her mother's pride into an expression of exulting praise, “that he had been a good son, and she believed he had done his duty as a man.” Under the care of a mother who flooded common words with such a wealth of meaning, the boy was not likely to mistake mediocrity for excellence, but would naturally domesticate in his heart lofty principles of conduct, and act from them as a matter of course, without expecting or obtaining praise. The consequence was that in early life, and in his first occupation as surveyor, and through the stirring events of the French war, he built up character day by day in a systematic endurance of hardship; in a constant sacrifice of inclinations to duty; in taming hot passions into the service of reason; in assiduously learning from other minds; in wringing knowledge, which could not be taught him, from the reluctant grasp of a flinty experience; in completely mastering every subject on which he fastened his intellect, so that whatever he knew he knew perfectly and forever, transmuting it into mind, and sending it forth in acts.

Intellectual and moral principles, which other men lazily contemplate and talk about, he had learned through a process which gave them the toughness of muscle and bone. A man thus sound at the core and on the surface of his nature; so full at once of integrity and sagacity; speaking ever from the level of his character, and always ready to substantiate opinions with deeds; a man without any morbid egotism, or pretension, or extravagance; simple, modest, dignified, incorruptible; never giving advice which events did not endorse as wise, never lacking fortitude to bear calamities which resulted from his advice being overruled: such a man could not but exact that recognition of commanding genius which inspires universal confidence. Accordingly, when the contest between the colonies and the mother country was assuming its inevitable form of civil war, he was found to be our natural leader in virtue of being the ablest man among a crowd of able men. When he appeared among the eloquent orators, the ingenious thinkers, the vehement patriots of the Revolution, his modesty and temperate professions could not conceal his superiority; he at once, by the very nature of great character, was felt to be their leader; towered up, indeed, over all their heads as naturally, as the fountain sparkling yonder in this July sun, which, in its long, dark, downward journey forgets not the altitude of its parent lake, and no sooner finds an outlet in our lower lands than it mounts by an impatient instinct, surely up to the level of its far-off inland source.

After the first flush and fever of the Revolutionary excitement was over, and the haggard fact of civil war was visible in all its horrors, it soon appeared how vitally important was such a character to the success of such a cause. We have already seen that the issue of the contest depended, not on

the decision of this or that battle, not on the occupation of this or that city, but on the power of the colonists to wear out the patience, exhaust the resources, and tame the pride of Great Britain. The King, when Lord North threatened in 1778 to resign unless the war were discontinued, expressed his determination to lose his crown rather than acknowledge the independence of the rebels; he was as much opposed to that acknowledgment in 1783 as 1778; and it was only by a pressure from without, and when the expenditures for the war had reached a hundred million of pounds, that a reluctant consent was forced from that small, spiteful mind. Now there was undoubtedly a vast majority of the American people unalterably resolved on independence, but they were spread through thirteen colonies, were not without mutual jealousies, and were represented in a Congress whose delegated powers were insufficient to prosecute war with vigor. The problem was, how to combine the strength, allay the suspicions, and sustain the patriotism of the people during a contest peculiarly calculated to distract and weaken their energies. Washington solved this problem by the true geometry of indomitable personal character. He was the soul of the Revolution, felt at its center, and felt through all its parts, as an uniting, organizing, animating power. Comprehensive as America itself, through him, and through him alone, could the strength of America act. He was security in defeat, cheer in despondency, light in darkness, hope in despair, the one man in whom all could have confidence, the one man whose sun-like integrity and capacity shot rays of light and heat through everything they shone upon. He would not stoop to thwart the machinations of envy; he would not stoop to contradict the fictions and forgeries of calumny; and he did not need to do it. Before the effortless might of his

character they stole away and withered and died; and through no instrumentality of his did their abject authors become immortal as the maligners of Washington.

To do justice to Washington's military career we must consider that he had to fuse the hardest individual materials into a mass of national force, which was to do battle not only with disciplined armies, but with frost, famine, and disease. Missing the rapid succession of brilliant engagements between forces almost equal, and the dramatic storm and swift consummation of events which European campaigns have made familiar, there are those who see in him only a slow, sure, and patient commander, without readiness of combination or energy of movement. But the truth is the quick eye of his prudent audacity seized occasions to deliver blows with the prompt felicity of Marlborough or Wellington. He evinced no lack of the highest energy and skill when he turned back the tide of defeat at Monmouth, or in the combinations which preceded the siege of Yorktown, or in the rapid and masterly movements by which, at a period when he was considered utterly ruined, he swooped suddenly down upon Trenton, broke up all the enemy's posts on the Delaware, and snatched Philadelphia from a superior and victorious foe. Again, some eulogists have caricatured him as a passionless, imperturbable, "proper" man; but at the battle of Monmouth General Lee was privileged to discover that from those firm, calm lips could leap words hotter and more smiting than the hot June sun that smote down upon their heads. Indeed, Washington's incessant and various activity answered to the strange complexity of his position, as the heart and brain of a Revolution, which demanded not merely generalship, but the highest qualities of the statesman, the diplomatist, and the patriot. As we view him in his long seven years' struggle with the perilous

difficulties of his situation, his activity constantly entangled in a mesh of conflicting considerations; with his eye fixed on Congress, on the States, and on the people, as well as on the enemy; compelled to compose sectional quarrels, to inspire faltering patriotism, and to triumph over all the forces of stupidity and selfishness; compelled to watch, and wait, and warn, and forbear, and endure, as well as to act; compelled, amid vexations and calamities which would sting the dullest sensibilities into madness, to transmute the fire of the fiercest passion into an element of fortitude; and, especially, as we view him coming out of that terrible and obscure scene of trial and temptation, without any bitterness in his virtue, or hatred in his patriotism, but full of the loftiest wisdom and serenest power; as we view all this in the order of its history, that placid face grows gradually sublime and in its immortal repose looks rebuke to our presumptuous eulogium of the genius which breathes through it!

We all know that toward the end of the wearying struggle, and when his matchless moderation and invincible fortitude were about to be crowned with the hallowing glory which liberty piously reserves for her triumphant saints and martyrs, that a committee of his officers proposed to make him king; and we sometimes do him the cruel injustice to say that his virtue overcame the temptation. He was not knave enough, or fool enough, to be tempted by such criminal baubles. What was his view of the proposal? He who had never sought popularity but whom popularity had sought; he who had entered public life not for the pleasure of exercising power but for the satisfaction of performing duty; he to be insulted and outraged by such an estimate of his services and such a conception of his character,—why, it could provoke in him nothing but an instantaneous burst of indignation and

abhorrence!—and in his reply you will find that these emotions strain the language of reproof beyond the stern courtesy of military decorum.

The war ended, and our independence acknowledged, the time came when American liberty, threatened by anarchy, was to be reorganized in the constitution of the United States. As president of the convention which framed the constitution, Washington powerfully contributed to its acceptance by the States. The people were uncertain as to the equity of its compromise of opposing interests and adjustment of clashing claims. By this eloquent and learned man they were advised to adopt it; by that eloquent and learned man they were advised to reject it; but there, at the end of the instrument itself, and first among many eminent and honored names, was the bold and honest signature of George Washington, a signature which always carried with it the integrity and the influence of his character; and that was an argument stronger even than any furnished by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay. The constitution was accepted; and Washington, whose fame, to use Allston's familiar metaphor, was ever the shadow cast by his excellence, was of course unanimously elected President. This is no place to set forth the glories of his civil career. It is sufficient to say that placed amid circumstances where ignorance, vanity, or rashness would have worked ruinous mischief and disunion, he consolidated the government. One little record in his diary, just before he entered upon his office, is a key to the spirit of his administration. His journey from Mount Vernon to the seat of government was a triumphal procession. At New York the air was alive with that tumult of popular applause which has poisoned the integrity by intoxicating the pride of so many eminent generals and statesmen. What was the feeling of Washington? Did he have a misan-

thrope's cynical contempt for the people's honest tribute of gratitude? Did he have a demagogue's fierce elation in being the object of the people's boundless admiration? No. His sensations, he tells us, were as painful as they were pleasing. His lofty and tranquil mind thought of the possible reverse of the scene after all his exertions to do good. The streaming flags, the loud acclamations, the thunder of the cannon, and the shrill music piercing through all other sounds,—these sent his mind sadly forward to the solitude of his closet, where, with the tender and beautiful austerity of his character, he was perhaps to sacrifice the people's favor for the people's safety, and to employ every granted power of a constitution he so perfectly understood in preserving peace, in restraining faction, and in giving energy to all those constitutional restraints on popular passions, by which the wisdom of to-morrow rules the recklessness of to-day.

In reviewing a life thus passed in enduring hardship and confronting peril, fretted by constant cares, and worn by incessant drudgery, we are at first saddened by the thought that such heroic virtue should have been purchased by the sacrifice of happiness. But we wrong Washington in bringing his enjoyments to the test of our low standards. He has everything for us to venerate, nothing for our commiseration. He tasted of that joy which springs from a sense of great responsibilities willingly incurred and great duties magnanimously performed. To him was given the deep bliss of seeing the austere countenance of inexorable duty melt into approving smiles, and to him was realized the poet's rapturous vision of her celestial compensations:

"Stern Lawgiver! yet thou dost wear  
The Godhead's most benignant grace,  
Nor know we anything so fair  
As is the smile upon thy face."

It has been truly said that “men of intemperate minds cannot be free; their passions forge their fetters;” but no clank of any chain, whether of avarice or ambition, gave the least harshness to the movement of Washington’s ample mind. In him America has produced at least one man whose free soul was fit to be liberty’s chosen home. As was his individual freedom so should be our national freedom. We have seen all along that American liberty in its sentiment and idea is no opinionated, will-strong, untamable passion, bursting all bounds of moral restraint and hungering after anarchy and license, but a creative and beneficent energy, organizing itself in laws, professions, trades, arts, institutions. From its extreme practical character however it is liable to contract a taint which has long vitiated English freedom. To the Anglo-Saxon mind liberty is not apt to be the enthusiast’s mountain nymph, with cheeks wet with morning dew and clear eyes that mirror the heavens, but rather is she an old dowager lady, fatly invested in commerce and manufactures, and peevishly fearful that enthusiasm will reduce her establishment and panics cut off her dividends. Now the moment property becomes timid, agrarianism becomes bold; and the industry which liberty has created, liberty must animate, or it will be plundered by the impudent and rapacious idleness its slavish fears incite. Our political institutions again are but the body of which liberty is the soul; their preservation depends on their being continually inspired by the light and heat of the sentiment and idea whence they sprung; and when we timorously suspend, according to the latest political fashion, the truest and dearest maxims of our freedom at the call of expediency or the threat of passion, when we convert politics into a mere game of interests, unhallowed by a single great and unselfish principle,—we may be sure that our worst passions are busy

“forging our fetters,” that we are proposing all those intricate problems which red republicanism so swiftly solves, and giving manifest destiny pertinent hints to shout new anthems of atheism over victorious rapine. The liberty which our fathers planted and for which they sturdily contended and under which they grandly conquered, is a rational and temperate but brave and unyielding freedom, the august mother of institutions, the hardy nurse of enterprise, the sworn ally of justice and order; a liberty that lifts her awful and rebuking face equally upon the cowards who would sell and the braggarts who would pervert her precious gifts of rights and obligations; and this liberty we are solemnly bound at all hazards to protect, at any sacrifice to preserve, and by all just means to extend, against the unbridled excesses of that ugly and brazen hag, originally scorned and detested by those who unwisely gave her infancy a home, but which now, in her enormous growth and favored deformity, reels with bloodshot eyes and dishevelled tresses and words of unshamed slavishness, into halls where liberty should sit throned!

# LORD PLAYFAIR



SIR LYON PLAYFAIR, first Lord Playfair, eminent English chemist and statesman, the son of an inspector-general of hospitals at Bengal, was born at Meerut, India, May 21, 1819, and died at London, May 29, 1898. He was educated at the universities of St. Andrews, Edinburgh, London, and Giessen, Germany. His interest was attracted from medicine to chemistry, and after he had worked at the laboratory of Baron Liebig, in 1858, he became professor of chemistry at the University of Edinburgh. Previously, he had been appointed, by Sir Robert Peel, member of the royal commission on public health, which did much for modern sanitation. In successive years he was a famine commissioner to Ireland and a member of many other committees of public utility. He helped to reorganize the civil service after a method which was called "the Playfair scheme." Besides serving as professor in the school of mines and inspector-general of the government schools of science, he was elected member of Parliament, and sat continuously until 1892, when he was raised to the peerage. Among other posts held by him were those of postmaster-general (1873-74), vice-president of the council (1886), lord-in-waiting to the late Queen Victoria, and was moreover member of the Legion of Honor and of many other British and foreign orders. He took a great interest in education and published several treatises, among them one on "Primary and Technical Education" (1870), another "On Teaching Universities, and Examining Boards" (1872), and still another on "Universities in their Relation to Professional Education" (1873).

## THE EVOLUTION OF UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

DELIVERED IN 1894

RECENTLY the London University Commission, of which I was a member, has made its report, and during its sitting we received much evidence in favor of the University Extension scheme, as well as some evidence hostile to it. I think the opposition arose from a misunderstanding of its origin and purposes, and upon these I should like to address you. The extension of university knowledge and educational methods to the people who are unable to attend the university courses during the day, is one of the processes of evolution of popular education which has been trying to organize itself for about a century.

Universities in former times used to be more largely attended than now. Bologna University was said to be attended by 20,000 students, and Paris and Oxford by 30,000. These numbers are open to doubt, though, as there were few grammar schools, and as students entered at ten and eleven years of age, the universities were no doubt more frequented than they are now, and by a poorer class of students, who often begged their way to the university from monastery to monastery. Chaucer alludes to this when he says:

“ Busily gan for the souls to pray  
Of them that gave him wherewith to scolay.”

Education in the sense we are now considering it, as attainable by the people at large in their hours of leisure after their day's work, is the product of the present century. Let us consider the conditions under which the demands for it arose.

Up to the last quarter of the eighteenth century the learned class and the working class were separated by a high impassable wall, because each spoke in a language that the other could not understand. For about two thousand years the learned class spoke, thought, and talked in Latin, and for about two centuries Greek had been raised as a second wall of separation between the learned and the people. No doubt the people were creating knowledge of another kind by enlarging their conception of things while the learned were dealing with literature and philosophy through words.

I do not allude to the early days when Rome and Greece spoke their own vernacular, and when their writers and philosophers largely recruited themselves from the people. The learned class were then the sons of citizens, and were in possession of the accumulated experiences of the people. I refer to a much later period after the dark ages when the

light gradually illuminating the darkness was the borrowed light of Rome and Greece. It was then that the learned linked themselves to the past and separated themselves from the present. Then it was that they adopted the ancient languages as the expression of their thoughts and teaching, while the people went on their way without caring for the pedants whose very language was incomprehensible to them.

Among the people the industries were growing by experience and modern science was being evolved as an outcome of their enlarged conceptions. Working men then made journeys to enlarge these experiences, and the memory of the old habit still survives in the industries under such familiar names as "journeyman carpenter," "journeyman blacksmith," and so on; for the tyro was a mere apprentice until he graduated to his full position as a working man by an education not got at school but obtained in journeys, which enlarged his experiences and knowledge. When I was a student in Germany in 1838, I recollect constantly meeting parties of these journeymen on the way from one town to another. An old German saying, freely translated, explains how technical education was attained in this way:

"Who shall pupil be? Every one.  
Who shall craftsman be? Who good work has done.  
Who shall master be? He whose thought has won."

By the end of the fifteenth century most of our present industries were fairly established in this way. During that century the printing press was introduced, and knowledge was ultimately widely spread as well as conserved. In the sixteenth century newspapers were published in the vernacular, and the people got a powerful means of recording their mental conceptions, which were chiefly those of a developing science. In England, however, newspapers did not

fully establish themselves till the period of the civil war, and then they were poor in quality. They scarcely came into the life of the nation till the reign of Queen Anne, during Marlborough's victories. The learned class still adhered to their Latin and Greek, and kept themselves outside of these great movements. Latin was, in fact, the universal language for learning, being a sort of glorified Volapük. Sometimes a treatise was written in the vernacular, as when Bacon wrote in English "The Advancement of Learning," though he asked his friend Dr. Playfair to translate it into Latin, because, he says, "The privateness of the language, wherein it is written, limits my readers," and its translation into Latin "would give a second verse of that work." So also when Bacon sends his "De Augmentis Scientiarum" to the Prince of Wales, he says, it is in Latin, "as a book which will live and be a citizen of the world, as English books are not." The vernacular was, however, being introduced into our schools, though it was not generally used until the close of the eighteenth century. Learned papers and discourses were now published in English, although they were at first duplicated into Latin. A general use of the vernacular made a common road on which both the learned classes and the working classes could again travel as they had done in the grand old days of Greece and Rome, when Plato and Aristotle and Cicero and Horace spoke, and wrote, and thought in the common languages of the people.

Now again the desire for popular education, of which university extension is one of the signs. Let us see how that form of popular education became involved in this movement, among the people, who were shut off from the possibility of attending colleges of learning. Workingmen know that one of their two hands must always be employed

in earning their daily bread, but they have another hand with which they could work for their own improvement and for that of the community if they only had the opportunity and knew how to employ it.

Before the age of printing books were necessarily costly, so the ancient method of obtaining knowledge was to attend public lectures or discourses, and they became the chief mode of higher education. It was so in the classical times when people flocked to the market-place in Athens to hear Socrates, and to the groves of Academus to hear Plato, or joined the Peripatetics in the walks of the Lyceum to listen to the scientific teaching of Aristotle. So it continued in every country where learning was cared for at all, and poor students went, begging on the way, to listen to lectures by Abélard in France, Chrysoloras in Italy, or Erasmus in Oxford and then at Cambridge. When printing presses multiplied books knowledge could be acquired by those who read, and was no longer confined to the few who could discourse. Public libraries for the people are, however, only inventions of our own day, and at the beginning of this century did not exist.

The people readily co-operated with Birkbeck and others in founding institutes of their own where they could read and hear lectures. One of the earliest of these exists in the city under the well-known name of the "Birkbeck Institute," which has now a new lease of active life as a systematic school of science and commerce. The people in the early part of the century were only groping in the dark for the kind of higher education which they desired. The mechanics' institutes supplemented small and defective libraries by single and unconnected lectures.

In fact, the associated members of these institutes scarcely knew what they wanted. Some joined the institutes for

amusement, some for instruction. Both were proper objects of desire, but were difficult to amalgamate, so a strange mixture was made, often not very wisely, by the inexperienced managers of the new mechanics' institutes. One of the most prosperous of them asked me to give a single lecture on chemistry, in the year 1846, and sent me its program for the preceding year. It was as follows: "Wit and Humor, with Comic Songs—Women Treated in Novel Manner—Legerdemain and Spirit-Rapping—The Devil (with illustrations)—The Heavenly Bodies and the Stellar System—Palestine and the Holy Land—Speeches by Eminent Friends of Education, interspersed with Music, to be followed by a Ball. Price to the whole 2s. 6d. Refreshments in an Anteroom."

Compare your program of sound work with this motley assemblage of professors, ventriloquists, conjurers, and musicians, and you will see how much the scheme of university extension has molded the demand for knowledge among the people and turned it into channels which will refresh and irrigate the various districts through which it passes. The mechanics' institutions where they still exist have altered themselves into systematic schools, either scientific, technical, or artistic, but they have still left outside the people who have not been trained to use schools.

The universities associated to supply this want. In the universities there are always a number of zealous graduates who desire to extend to others the knowledge possessed by themselves. They are animated by the spirit of the famous Loup de Ferrières, who, a thousand years ago, wrote to Charles the Bold: "I desire to teach what I have learned and am daily learning."

This spirit led to the scheme of university extension.

Gradually, not yet completely, but surely, the people who demand your courses of lectures appreciate and follow them because they are systematic and in proper sequence; and because the lecturer also becomes the tutor to each student who really desires to understand and profit by the subject taught. In ordinary popular lectures the lecturer treats his audience as a mass, throwing his information broadcast over it, ignorant as to where it may fall, and careless as to whether the seed falls on fertile soil or on stony places where it can take no root.

When the lecturer acts also as a tutor he looks upon his audience as individuals, he drills his seed into productive soil, taking care that the ground is prepared to receive it, and that each seed gets its proper proportion of food-giving manure. The minds of the teacher and the taught get into an intellectual grapple and as the former should be the stronger man, he is enabled to drag the mind of the student from the dark holes in which it may lurk into the broad light of day.

In a college or technical school a tutorial system ought always to be combined with the lectures. Under your system of peripatetic lectures it is more difficult of application, but you do much by the weekly exercises and final examination as well as by making the courses consequential in series. The examiners for the certificates, who are not the lecturers, testify by their university experience to the good results which are attained.

To understand the object of the promoters of university extension it is important neither to exaggerate these results nor to depreciate the value of the system. The main purpose is not to educate the masses, but to permeate them with the desire for intellectual improvement, and to show them

methods by which they can attain this desire. Every man who acquires a taste for learning and is imbued with the desire to acquire more of it becomes more valuable as a citizen, because he is more intelligent and perceptive. As Shakespeare says:

“ Learning is but an adjunct to ourself. . .  
It adds a precious seeing to the eye.”

It is this addition of “ a precious seeing to the eye ” which produces progress in science. Of the five gateways of knowledge, the “ eye gate ” is not opened indifferently to all. The range of vision of the bat and of the eagle is very different. The most familiar objects to man, like air and water, are nothing more to the untutored intellect of man than the primrose was to Peter Bell:

“ A primrose by a river's brim  
A yellow primrose was to him,  
And it was nothing more.”

Before the mind of man learns to question Nature, he is apt to look for the explanations of phenomena to the intellectual conceptions of his own untutored mind. When he knows how to put an experimental question to Nature he is on the high road to knowledge, “ *Prudens quæstio dimidium scientiæ est* ”—“ A wise question is half of knowledge.”

Thales, who flourished in the seventh century before Christ, was among the first philosophers to speculate upon the constitution of the universe. He thought everything was made out of water. The sun dipped in the evening below the western wave, and rose out of the ocean in the east mightily refreshed by its huge drink—so the sun was made out of water. Water, as the river Nile, overflowed the land of Egypt and crops grew in luxuriance—so plants were made out of water. The ocean, when it was stormy, was en-

gaged in the manufacture of earth, and the proof is that after a storm new sand and pebbles are heaped on the shore. The real nature of water was only discovered at the end of the last century.

How little our ancestors knew about air, and how little we yet know about it in the nineteenth century! Yet, if mere observation could suffice to know a thing, air should be better understood than anything in the world. When the first man drew his first breath he began his familiarity with air. In each phase of his life man meets it at every turn. It fans him with gentle breezes and it buffets him with storms. It is never absent from every act of his existence, and the last act of his life is his inability to respire it. The first philosopher who studied air in a scientific way was Anaximenes. He lived 548 years before Christ, and men have been studying air ever since, and have laboriously brought up our knowledge to our present position. Aristotle brought his shrewd powers of observation upon air, and established that it was a material and not a spirit. A wonderful Saracen, called Alhazen, found that it had weight, and showed that it was heavier at the bottom of a mountain than at its top. Galileo again took up the study of air in 1630, and made important discoveries which led Torricelli and others to the discovery of the barometer.

It is scarcely more than a century since mankind gave up air as an element, and it is only during my lifetime that we have been taught the true chemical nature of air, and that its relation to the great phenomena of vegetable and animal life have been explained. When I was first a student of chemistry, air consisted of nitrogen and oxygen with watery vapor. During my life carbonic acid, ammonia, nitric acid, ozone, and the wide range of bacteria and like organisms

have been discovered. We now know that all the foulness of the living and the products of the dead pass into the air, and are changed into the food of plants, so that the great abounding atmosphere becomes the grave of organic death and the candle of organic life. Plants and animals mutually feed on each other and the death and dissolution of one generation is needful for the growth of a succeeding one.

You see how slowly intellectual conceptions of the most common object gather round it. When we give a lecture to an ignorant audience on such subjects as air and water, we treat them from the platform of our own times—the nineteenth century. But our audience is not yet on that plane. In my old professorial days, in lecturing to classes of working men, I sometimes put myself on the platform on which Anaximenes stood 548 years before Christ, and argued as he did for the theory of the nature of air, and then mounted the ladders, taking my hearers with me, from platform to platform of discovery, till I reached that of the present day. This historical mode of illustration gave the working men a better notion of the methods of scientific discovery, and taught them more completely that science consists of conceptions obtained by a slow but steady questioning of Nature. In ancient times there was little science, because philosophers put the questions to their own minds and not to Nature. The rapid progress of science in recent times is due to our questioning Nature by means of experiment. This is the true foundation of science, as well expressed by Wordsworth:

. . . "to the solid ground  
Of Nature trusts the mind which builds for aye."

This need of experimental inquiry does not apply to mathematics, which was a product of the opening of Greek civiliza-

tion, and the achievements of the Greek geometers, Euclid, Archimedes, and Apollonius are still admirable at the present day.

If the untutored senses be sufficient to appreciate and understand what you see with your own eyes and hear with your own ears, it would not have required many thousand years for mankind to acquire our present imperfect knowledge about air and water. In explaining to our students the knowledge of to-day I think it would often be useful to show how it has been attained and how our crude faculties have become tutored faculties by close thinking, observation, and experiment upon the most familiar objects about us. Theories of the past have fallen as the leaves of trees fall, but while they existed they drew nutriment to the parent stem of knowledge. The theory of to-day is the error of to-morrow. Error in science is nothing but a shadow cast by the strong light of truth. Theories, as they arise, are an absolute necessity for the progress of science, because they collect in a common focus all the light which is shed upon a subject at a particular period. The descriptions of and arguments for the old theories I found very useful as ladders let down from the nineteenth century platform, which enabled my uneducated audience to mount to it by graduated steps, until they came to the same level of the science which I was trying to expound to them.

The world is still young and science is never old. It is sheer vanity for any generation to suppose that their state of knowledge represents the final triumph of truth. I think it is always useful in educating in modern science to show how much we owe to our ancestors by their laborious efforts to build it up. We have inherited so much from the past. Roger Bacon, writing so long ago as 1267, said: "The an-

cents have committed all the more errors just because they are ancients, for in matters of learning the youngest are in reality the oldest; modern generations ought to surpass their predecessors because they inherit their labors."

This thought, three centuries later, Francis Bacon put into his famous apothegm—*Antiquitas Seculi, Juventus Mundi*—antiquity in age is the youth of the world.

It is no small object in view that your purpose is to permeate the mass of people with the desire for knowledge. It is chiefly among them that great discoverers in science and great inventors in industry arise. I would refer you, as an illustration, to the past discoverers who have adored the lecture table of the Royal Institution in Albermarle street. With scarcely an exception they have sprung directly from the people. The original founder was Benjamin Thompson, afterwards Count Rumford, a provisional schoolmaster from New England; and the institution has had as successive professors Sir Humphrey Davy, the son of a woodcarver; Young, illustrious in politics, the son, I think, of a yeoman; Faraday, a newsboy; and Tyndall, who was of humble origin.

All of these men sprang from the people. Among inventors this origin from the people is still more marked. Watt was an instrument-maker; Wheatstone, who invented our telegraphs, was a maker of musical instruments; and Bell, who added the telephone, was a teacher of deaf-mutes; Stephenson, the inventor of locomotives, an engine-tender at a colliery; Arkwright, who revolutionized the cotton industry, was a barber. These instances might be multiplied indefinitely both from modern and ancient history.

The great humanizing movements of the world have sprung from the people. The Founder of our religion did not disdain to be called the son of Joseph the carpenter, and he took

his disciples from among the working men around him. Paul the tentmaker and Peter the fisherman found time to earn their daily bread and diffuse the religion of Christ. The growth of philosophy in Greece depended upon men who were using one hand to win their daily bread and the other to mold humanity. Socrates was a sculptor; Plato and Zeno were actively engaged in commerce; Aristotle was the son of a physician. They founded schools of thought, but they themselves were the products of Athens and Corinth when they were active seats of industrial activity.

I hope I have made myself intelligible when I argue that the University Extension movement is doing work of its own kind most valuable, not as an education of the people but as a means of permeating the people with a desire to be educated, and by giving them methods and subjects which they can use in continuing their education. Your opponents still object to the need of doing this, because they quote cases, such as I have mentioned, like Faraday, Watt, and Stephenson, where men of the people even in the absence of schools, educated themselves without aid from others and became great discoverers; so they say it is much more easy now to do likewise, when technical schools are covering the country.

I have spent a large portion of my life in helping to found these technical schools and therefore I fully appreciate their importance, but they do not even touch the ground covered by your movement. Such schools look to the education of a man for his daily work and only give what the Germans call *Brodstudien*, while the University Extension movement professes to give mental culture or what the Germans might call *Verständnisstudien*. No doubt one of your triumphs will be that the University Extension scheme will tend largely to feed schools of science and technical schools with students incited

to learn through your permeating influence in creating a taste for knowledge. This is as it should be.

During my life I have enjoyed the friendship of many men who have risen by their own great talents, such as Dalton, Faraday, Stephenson, Wheatstone, and Livingstone. I knew the great African discoverer when he rested his book on a spinning-jenny, snatching sentence after sentence as he passed it at work; and I attended the evening classes with him in Glasgow and saw him pay the pennies he had saved during the day as a cotton-spinner.

As I am recalling old memories I may say that three companions studied together in those days. One was James Young, a carpenter; Livingstone, a cotton-spinner; and myself, the son of a physician. Young the carpenter established a new industry and became very rich. His purse was always open to Livingstone for his African explorations; and, although he would never acknowledge it, my election committees never lacked funds from some mysterious donor, who I always believed was my old friend, for the contributions ceased at his death.

Were my old friends now alive, I would call them all as witnesses as to how much trouble and suffering would have been saved to them had they been able when young to enjoy the advantage which you now offer to the youth of this century by giving them the materials and methods of education. It is quite true that men of genius will cut out steps for themselves in the toilsome ascent of knowledge. The mistake of the argument is obvious.

All the dwellers in a plain do not surmount the mountain which frowns upon them at the end of the valley. A few daring spirits may reach the summit unaided and pass into the world beyond, but the great mass of men remain in the low-

lands where they were born. We can induce many of these to make excursions which will brighten their existence, by making roads and showing them how to use the roads. Perchance in doing so we may come upon a genius and put him on his way, and wish him Godspeed! The case should not be argued by contrasting a heaven-born talent with ordinary ability. All systems of education try to draw out the mental abilities of the scholar, but they do not profess to give the gifts of God or to create special abilities in man. Such great men as I have mentioned are discoverers of new truths in science, and the bulk of mankind must be content to live on a lower plane, but their life is made the happier, more graceful, and dignified by helping them to acquire some of that knowledge which shows them how the world has advanced and how society has been improved by the advances made in science, literature, and philosophy.

In our own time science has been the great civilizing agency. Within my own memory I have seen the origin of five inventions which have had more profound effect than revolutions in altering the conditions of kingdoms and nations throughout the world. I allude to steam-locomotion, telegraphy, telephony, photography, electric lighting, and electric locomotion. The discoverers in science are the artisans of civilization, their laboratories and the workshops, and their instruments of precision and experiment are the tools with which they perform their world-labor. By the system which you pursue the people are made to take an intelligent interest in these modes of civilization. The most intelligent nation will in future be the greatest nation, and your work is to do your part in permeating the people with this general intelligence which is so necessary for their prosperity in the competition of the world.

# CANON KINGSLEY



CHARLES KINGSLEY, a distinguished English clergyman, poet, novelist, and social reformer, was born at Dartmoor, Devon, June 12, 1819, and died at Eversley, Hampshire, Jan. 23, 1875. Educated at King's College, London, and at Magdalen College, Cambridge, he took Orders in the Church of England and in 1844 became rector of Eversley, of which parish he was incumbent until his death. He early took a warm, practical interest in the working classes, as shown in his powerful story, "Alton Locke," which earned him, from the sociological views presented in it, the title of "the Chartist Parson." "Yeast, a Problem" followed, in which its author deals with topics interesting to the agricultural laborer. Then successively appeared two historical novels, "Hypatia" and "Westward Ho," the former dealing with the advance of Christianity in face of abounding Paganism, and the latter painting with much brilliance the opening of the New World to the Elizabethan voyagers. Prior to these appeared a drama, "The Saint's Tragedy," followed by a volume of "Poems and Ballads," among which are the beautiful lyric, "Three Fishers went Sailing out into the West" and the tender song, "O Mary go and Call the Cattle Home." He also published some volumes of thoughtful "Sermons for the Times," to some of which exception was taken by the Bishop of London, who was averse to the Christian socialism preached by Kingsley and his Broad Church brother, Frederick Denison Maurice. His other writings include the novels "Two Years Ago," and "Hereward;" "Glaucus," "The Heroes," "Alexandria and Her Schools," "Madam How and Lady Why," and "At Last, a Christmas in the West Indies," together with the delightful fairy tale, "The Water Babies," which however is not merely a fairy tale, but an allegory of remarkable depth, insight, and power; a parable of man's spiritual life upon earth. Canon Kingsley was also a Canon of Westminster and a chaplain to his Queen. See his Life by Mrs. Kingsley.

## SERMON: THE TRANSFIGURATION

"Jesus taketh Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them."—Mark ix, 2.

THE second lesson for this morning service brings us to one of the most wonderful passages in our blessed Saviour's whole stay on earth, namely, his transfiguration. The story as told by the different evangelists is

this,—That our Lord took Peter, and John, and James his brother, and led them up into a high mountain apart, which mountain may be seen to this very day. It is a high peaked hill, standing apart from all the hills around it, with a small smooth space of ground upon the top, very fit, from its height and its loneliness, for a transaction like the transfiguration, which our Lord wished no one but these three to behold.

There the apostles fell asleep; while our blessed Lord, who had deeper thoughts in his heart than they had, knelt down and prayed to his Father and our Father, which is in heaven. And as he prayed the form of his countenance was changed, and his raiment became shining white as the light; and there appeared Moses and Elijah talking with him. They talked of matters which the angels desire to look into, of the greatest matters that ever happened in this earth since it was made; of the redemption of the world, and of the death which Christ was to undergo at Jerusalem.

And as they were talking the apostles awoke, and found into what glorious company they had fallen while they slept. What they felt no mortal man can tell—that moment was worth to them all the years they had lived before. When they had gone up with Jesus into the mount he was but the poor carpenter's son, wonderful enough to them, no doubt, with his wise, searching words, and his gentle, loving looks that drew to him all men who had hearts left in them, and wonderful enough, too, from all the mighty miracles which they had seen him do; but still he was merely a man like themselves, poor, and young, and homeless, who felt the heat and the cold and the rough roads as much as they did. They could feel that he spake as never man spake; they could see that God's Spirit and power was on him as it had never been on any man in their time.

God had even enlightened their reason by his Spirit, to know that he was the Christ, the Son of the living God. But still it does seem they did not fully understand who and what he was; they could not understand how the Son of God should come in the form of a despised and humble man; they did not understand that his glory was to be a spiritual glory.

They expected his kingdom to be a kingdom of this world; they expected his glory to consist in palaces, and armies, and riches, and jewels, and all the magnificence with which Solomon and the old Jewish kings were adorned; they thought that he was to conquer back again from the Roman emperor all the inestimable treasures of which the Romans had robbed the Jews, and that he was to make the Jewish nation like the Roman, the conquerors and masters of all the nations of the earth. So that it was a puzzling thing to their minds why he should be King of the Jews at the very time that he was but a poor tradesman's son, living on charity. It was to show them that his kingdom was the kingdom of heaven that he was transfigured before them.

They saw his glory—the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. The form of his countenance was changed; all the majesty, and courage, and wisdom, and love, and resignation, and pity, that lay in his noble heart, shone out through his face, while he spoke of his death which he should accomplish at Jerusalem—the Holy Ghost that was upon him, the Spirit of wisdom, and love, and beauty—the Spirit which produces everything that is lovely in heaven and earth, in soul and body, blazed out through his eyes, and all his glorious countenance, and made him look like what he was—a God.

My friends, what a sight! Would it not be worth while to journey thousands of miles, to go through all difficulties,

dangers, that man ever heard of, for one sight of that glorious face, that we might fall down upon our knees before it, and, if it were but for a moment, give way to the delight of finding something that we could utterly love and utterly adore? I say the delight of finding something to worship; for if there is a noble, if there is a holy, if there is a spiritual feeling in man, it is the feeling which bows him down before those who are greater, and wiser, and holier than himself. I say that feeling of respect for what is noble is a heavenly feeling.

The man who has lost it—the man who feels no respect for those who are above him in age, above him in knowledge, above him in wisdom, above him in goodness,—that man shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven. It is only the man who is like a little child, and feels the delight of having some one to look up to, who will ever feel delight in looking up to Jesus Christ, who is the Lord of lords and King of kings. It was the want of respect, it was the dislike of feeling any one superior to himself, which made the devil rebel against God and fall from heaven. It will be the feeling of complete respect, the feeling of kneeling at the feet of one who is immeasurably superior to ourselves in everything that will make up the greatest happiness of heaven. This is a hard saying, and no man can understand it save he to whom it is given by the Spirit of God.

That the apostles had this feeling of immeasurable respect for Christ there is no doubt, else they would never have been apostles. But they felt more than this. There were other wonders in that glorious vision besides the countenance of our Lord. His raiment, too, was changed, and became all brilliant, white as the light itself. Was not that a lesson to them? Was it not if our Lord had said to them, “I am

a king, and have put on glorious apparel; but whence does the glory of my raiment come? I have no need of fine linen, and purple, and embroidery, the work of men's hands; I have no need to send my subjects to mines and caves to dig gold and jewels to adorn my crown: the earth is mine and the fulness thereof. All this glorious earth with its trees and its flowers, its sunbeams and its storms, is mine. I made it; I can do what I will with it.

“All the mysterious laws by which the light and the heat flow out forever from God's throne, to lighten the sun, and the moon, and the stars of heaven—they are mine. I am the light of the world—the light of men's bodies as well as of their souls; and here is my proof of it. Look at me. I am he that ‘decketh himself with light as it were with a garment, who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters, and walketh upon the wings of the wind.’ ”

This was the message which Christ's glory brought the apostles—a message which they could never forget. The spiritual glory of his countenance had shown them that he was a spiritual king, that his strength lay in the spirit of power, and wisdom, and beauty, and love, which God had given him without measure; and it showed them, too, that there was such a thing as a spiritual body, such a body as each of us some day shall have if we be found in Christ at the resurrection of the just—a body which shall not hide a man's spirit when it becomes subject to the wear and tear of life, and disease, and decay; but a spiritual body—a body which shall be filled with our spirits, which shall be perfectly obedient to our spirits—a body through which the glory of our spirits shall shine out, as the glory of Christ's spirit shone out through his body at the transfiguration. Brethren, we know not yet what we shall be, but this we do know, that when

he shall appear, “we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.”

Thus our Lord taught them by his appearance that there is such a thing as a spiritual body, while, by the glory of his raiment in addition to his other miracles, he taught them that he had power over the laws of nature, and could, in his own good time, “change the bodies of their humiliation, that they might be made like unto his glorious body, according to the mighty working by which he is able to subdue all things to himself.”

But there was yet another lesson which the apostles learned from the transfiguration of our Lord. They beheld Moses and Elijah talking with him:—Moses the great lawgiver of their nation, Elijah the chief of all the Jewish prophets. We must consider this a little to find out the whole depth of its meaning. You remember how Christ had spoken of himself as having come, not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them. You remember, too, how he had always said that he was the person of whom the Law and the Prophets had spoken.

Here was an actual sign and witness that his words were true—here was Moses, the giver of the Law, and Elijah, the chief of the Prophets, talking with him, bearing witness to him in their own persons, and showing, too, that it was his death and his perfect sacrifice that they had been shadowing forth in the sacrifices of the law and in the dark speeches of prophecy. For they talked with him of his death, which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem.

What more perfect testimony could the apostles have had to show them that Jesus of Nazareth, their Master, was he of whom the Law and the Prophets spoke; that he was indeed the Christ for whom Moses and Elijah, and all the saints of

old, had looked; and that he was come, not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them? We can hardly understand the awe and the delight with which the disciples must have beheld those blessed three—Moses, and Elias, and Jesus Christ, their Lord, talking together before their very eyes. For of all men in the world, Moses and Elias were to them the greatest. All true-hearted Israelites, who knew the history of their nation, and understood the promises of God, must have felt that Moses and Elias were the two greatest heroes and saviours of their nation, whom God had ever yet raised up.

And the joy and the honor of thus seeing them face to face, the very men whom they had loved and reverenced in their thoughts, whom they had heard and read of from their childhood, as the greatest ornaments and glories of their nation—the joy and the honor, I say, of that unexpected sight, added to the wonderful majesty which was suddenly revealed to their transfigured Lord, seemed to have been too much for them—they knew not what to say.

Such company seemed to them for the moment heaven enough; and St. Peter, first finding words, exclaimed, “Lord, it is good for us to be here. If thou wilt, let us build three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.”

Not, I fancy, that they intended to worship Moses and Elias, but that they felt that Moses and Elias, as well as Christ, had each a divine message, which must be listened to; and therefore they wished that each of them might have his own tabernacle, and dwell among men, and each teach his own particular doctrine and wisdom in his own school. It may seem strange that they should put Moses and Elias so on an equality with Christ, but the truth was, that as yet they

understood Moses and Elias better than they did Christ. They had heard and read of Moses and Elijah all their lives—they were acquainted with all their actions and words—they knew thoroughly what great and noble men the Spirit of God had made them, but they did not understand Christ in like manner.

They did not yet feel that God had given him the Spirit without measure—they did not understand that he was not only to be a lawgiver and a prophet, but a sacrifice for sin, the conqueror of death and hell, who was to lead captivity captive, and receive inestimable gifts for men. Much less did they think that Moses and Elijah were but his servants—that all their spirit and their power had been given by him.

But this also they were taught a moment afterwards; for a bright cloud overshadowed them, hiding from them the glory of God the Father, whom no man hath seen or can see, who dwells in the light which no man can approach unto; and out of that cloud a voice, saying, “This is my beloved Son; hear ye him;” and then, hiding their faces in fear and wonder, they fell to the ground; and when they looked up, the vision and the voice had alike passed away, and they saw no man but Christ alone. Was not that enough for them? Must not the meaning of the vision have been plain to them? They surely understood from it that Moses and Elijah were, as they had ever believed them to be, great and good, true messengers of the living God; but that their message and their work was done—that Christ, whom they had looked for was come—that all the types of the law were realized, and all the prophecies fulfilled, and that henceforward Christ, and Christ alone, was to be their prophet and their lawgiver.

Was not this plainly the meaning of the Divine voice? For when they wished to build three tabernacles, and to

honor Moses and Elijah, the Law and the Prophets, as separate from Christ, that moment the heavenly voice warned them: "This—this is my beloved Son—hear ye him and him only, henceforward."

And Moses and Elijah, their work being done, forthwith vanished away, leaving Christ alone to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, and all other wisdom and righteousness that ever was or shall be. This is another lesson which Christ's transfiguration was meant to teach them and us, that Christ alone is to be henceforward our guide; that no philosophies or doctrines of any sort which are not founded on a true faith in Jesus Christ, and his life and death, are worth listening to; that God has manifested forth his beloved Son, and that him, and him only, we are to hear.

I do not mean to say that Christ came into the world to put down human learning. I do not mean that we are to despise human learning, as so many are apt to do now-a-days; for Christ came into the world not to destroy human learning, but to fulfil it—to sanctify it—to make human learning true, and strong, and useful, by giving it a sure foundation to stand upon, which is the belief and knowledge of his blessed self.

Just as Christ came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them,—to give them a spirit and a depth in men's eyes which they never had before—just so he came to fulfil all true philosophies, all the deep thoughts which men had ever thought about this wonderful world and their own souls, by giving them a spirit and a depth which they never had before. Therefore let no man tempt you to despise learning, for it is holy to the Lord.

There is one more lesson which we may learn from our Lord's transfiguration: when St. Peter said, "Lord! it is good

for us to be here," he spoke a truth. It was food for him to be there; nevertheless, Christ did not listen to his prayer. He and his two companions were not allowed to stay in that glorious company. And why? Because they had a work to do. They had glad tidings of great joy to proclaim to every creature, and it was, after all, but a selfish prayer, to wish to be allowed to stay in ease and glory on the mount while the whole world was struggling in sin and wickedness below them; for there is no meaning in a man's calling himself a Christian, or saying that he loves God, unless he is ready to hate what God hates, and to fight against that which Christ fought against, that is, sin.

No one has any right to call himself a servant of God, who is not trying to do away with some of the evil in the world around him. And, therefore, Christ was merciful when, instead of listening to St. Peter's prayer, he led the apostles down again from the mount, and sent them forth, as he did afterward, to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom to all nations. For Christ put a higher honor on St. Peter by that than if he had let him stay on the mount all his life, to behold his glory, and worship and adore. And he made St. Peter more like himself by doing so. For what was Christ's life? Not one of deep speculations, quiet thoughts, and bright visions, such as St. Peter wished to lead, but a life of fighting against evil; earnest, awful prayers and struggles within, continual labor of body and mind without, insult and danger, and confusion, and violent exertion, and bitter sorrow.

This was Christ's life—this is the life of almost every good man I ever heard of; this was St. Peter's, and St. James' and St. John's life afterwards. This was Christ's cup, which they were to drink of as well as he; this was the baptism of fire with which they were to be baptized as well as he; this was

to be their fight of faith; this was the tribulation through which they, like all other great saints, were to enter into the kingdom of heaven; for it is certain that the harder a man fights against evil, the harder evil will fight against him in return; but it is certain, too, that the harder a man fights against evil, the more he is like his Saviour Christ, and the more glorious will be his reward in heaven.

It is certain, too, that what was good for St. Peter is good for us. It is good for a man to have holy and quiet thoughts, and at moments to see into the very deepest meaning of God's word and God's earth, and to have, as it were, heaven opened before his eyes; and it is good for a man sometimes actually to feel his heart overpowered with the glorious majesty of God, and to feel it gushing out with love to his blessed Saviour, but it is not good for him to stop there, any more than it was for the apostles; they had to leave that glorious vision and come down from the mount, and do Christ's work; and so have we; for, believe me, one word of warning spoken to keep a little child out of sin, one crust of bread given to a beggar-man, because he is your brother, for whom Christ died, one angry word checked, when it is on your lips, for the sake of him who was meek and lowly in heart; in short, any, the smallest, endeavor of this kind to lessen the quantity of evil which is in yourselves, and in those around you, is worth all the speculations, and raptures, and visions, and frames, and feelings in the world; for those are the good fruits of faith, whereby alone the tree shall be known, whether it be good or evil.

# DR. JOSIAH G. HOLLAND



JOSIAH GILBERT HOLLAND, American journalist, novelist, and lecturer, editor of "The Century Magazine," was born at Belchertown, Mass., July 24, 1819, and died at New York, Oct. 12, 1881. In 1844, he graduated from the Berkshire Medical College, and practised medicine for a time, but this being distasteful to him, he took up the profession of teaching. He was for a while superintendent of schools at Vicksburg, Miss., where he did an important work in elevating educational standards. In 1849, on returning to his native State, he became associate editor of the "Springfield Republican," which he also partly owned. In 1866, he parted with his interests in that journal, in which appeared his famous "Timothy Titcomb Letters," and travelled abroad for a time. In 1870, he took part in the founding and assumed the editorship of "Scribner's Monthly," afterwards "The Century Magazine." In 1872, he was elected a member of the New York board of education, of which he was subsequently president. He also served as chairman of the board of trustees of the College of the City of New York. Among his publications are: the narrative poems, "Bitter-Sweet" and "Kathrina," both of which met with an unusual [sale]; "Plain Talks on Familiar Subjects"; "Gold Foil Hammered from Popular Proverbs" (1859); "Arthur Bonnicastle" (1873); "Nicholas Minturn" (1876), and "Seven Oaks" (1877). His "Life of Abraham Lincoln," which appeared in 1865, had also a phenomenal sale. In 1879, a complete edition of his poetical works was published. As a poet, Dr. Holland is best known by his dramatic poem, "Bitter-Sweet." His "The Mistress of the Manse" and "The Marble Prophecy" are also delightful narratives in verse. Entertaining, especially, are his essays on every-day morals and manners contributed under the *nom de plume* of "Timothy Titcomb" to the "Springfield Republican," as are the two volumes of papers on "Every-day Topics" reprinted from "Scribner's Monthly."

## EULOGY OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

DELIVERED AT SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS, APRIL 19, 1865

WE have assembled to honor the memory of the first citizen of the republic. We have come together to say and to hear something which shall express our love for him, our respect for his character, our high estima-

tion of his services and our grief at his untimely removal from the exalted office to which the voice of a nation had called him. Yet the deepest of our thoughts and emotions are always dumb. The ocean's floor has no voice, but on it and under it lie the ocean's treasures. The waves that roll and roar above tell no story but their own. Only the surface of the soul, like the surface of the sea, is vocal. Deep down within every one of our hearts there are thoughts we cannot speak, emotions that find no language, groanings that cannot be uttered. The surprise, the shock, the pity, the sense of outrage and of loss, the indignation, the grief, which bring us here—which have transformed a nation jubilant with hope and triumph into a nation of mourners—will find no full expression here. It is all a vain show—these tolling bells, these insignia of sorrow, these dirges, this suspension of business, these gatherings of the people, these faltering words. The drowning man throws up his arms and utters a cry to show that he lives, and is conscious of the element which whelms him; and this is all that we can do.

Therefore, without trying to tell how much we loved him, how much we honored him, and how deeply and tenderly we mourn his loss, let us briefly trace the reasons why his death has made so deep an impression upon us. It is not five years since the nation knew but little of Abraham Lincoln. We had heard of him as a man much honored by the members of a single party—not then dominant—in his own State. We had seen something of his work. We knew that he was held to be a man of notable and peculiar power and of pure character and life. Indeed, it is doubtful whether the nation knew enough of him to justify the selection made by the convention which presented him to the country as a candidate for its highest office. To this office, however, he was triumphantly

elected, and since that time his life has run like a thread of gold through the history of the most remarkable period of the nation's existence.

From the first moment of his introduction to national notice he assumed nothing but duty, pretended to nothing but integrity, boasted of nothing but the deeds of those who served him. On his journey to Washington he freely and unaffectedly confessed to those who insisted on hearing him speak that he did not understand their interests, but hoped to make himself acquainted with them. We had never witnessed such frankness, and it must be confessed that we were somewhat shocked by it. So simple and artless a nature in so high a place was so unusual, so unprecedented, indeed, that it seemed unadapted to it—incongruous with it. In the society which surrounded him at the national capital, embracing in its materials some of the most polished persons of our own and other lands, he remained the same unaffected, simple-hearted man. He was not polished and did not pretend to be. He aped no foreign airs, assumed no new manners, never presumed anything upon his position, was accessible to all and preserved throughout his official career the transparent, almost boyish simplicity that characterized his entrance upon it.

I do not think that it ever occurred to Mr. Lincoln that he was a ruler. More emphatically than any of his predecessors did he regard himself as the servant of the people—the instrument selected by the people for the execution of their will. He regarded himself as a public servant no less when he issued that immortal paper, the proclamation of emancipation, then when he sat at City Point, sending telegraphic despatches to the country, announcing the progress of General Grant's army. In all places, in all circumstances,

he was still the same unpretending, faithful, loyal public servant.

Unattractive in person, awkward in deportment, unrestrained in conversation, a story-lover and a story-teller, much of the society around him held him in ill-disguised contempt. It was not to be expected that fashion and courtly usage and conventional dignities and proprieties would find themselves at home with him; but even these at last made room for him, for nature's nobleman, with nature's manners, springing directly from a kind and gentle heart. Indeed, it took us all a long time to learn to love this homely simplicity, this artlessness, this direct outspeaking of his simple nature. But we did learn to love them at last, and to feel that anything else would be out of character with him. We learned that he did everything in his own way and we learned to love the way. It was Abraham Lincoln's way, and Abraham Lincoln was our friend. We had taken him into our hearts, and we would think of criticizing his words and ways no more than those of our bosom companions. Nay, we had learned to love him for these eccentricities, because they proved to us that he was not controlled by convention and precedent, but was a law unto himself.

Another reason why we loved him was that he first loved us. I do not believe a ruler ever lived who loved his people more sincerely than he. Nay, I do not believe the ruler ever lived who loved his enemies so well as he. All the insults heaped upon him by the foes of the government and the haters of his principles, purposes, and person, never seemed to generate in him a feeling of revenge or stir him to thoughts and deeds of bitterness. Throughout the terrible war over which he presided with such calmness and such power he never lost sight of the golden day, far in the indefinite future, when

peace and the restoration of fraternal harmony should come as the result and reward of all his labors. His heart embraced in its catholic sympathies the misguided men who were plotting his destruction, and I have no doubt that he could and did offer the prayer: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" We felt—we knew—that he suffered a thousand deaths in the destruction of the brave lives he had summoned to the country's defence, that he sympathized with every mourner in this mourning land, that he called us to no sacrifice which he would not gladly have made himself, that his heart was with the humble and the oppressed, and that he had no higher wish than to see his people peaceful, prosperous, and happy. He was one of us—one with us. Circumscribed in his affectionate regard by no creed, or party, or caste, or color, he received everybody, talked with everybody, respected everybody, loved everybody, and loved to serve everybody.

We loved and honored him, too, for his honesty and integrity. He seemed incapable of deceit and insusceptible of corruption. With almost unlimited power in his hands, possessing the highest confidence of the nation and the enthusiastic devotion of the most remarkable army the world ever saw, with a wealth of treasure and patronage at his disposal without precedent, and surrounded by temptations such as few men have the power to resist, he lived and died a man with clean hands and a name unsullied even by suspicion. Nothing but treasonable malignity accuses him of anything more culpable than errors of judgment and mistakes of policy. Never, even to save himself from blame, did he seek to disguise or conceal the truth. Never to serve himself did he sacrifice the interests of his country. Faithful among the faithless, true among the false, unselfish among the grasping,

he walked in his integrity. When he spoke we believed him. Unskilled in the arts of diplomacy, unpractised in the ingenuities of indirection and intrigue, unlearned in the formalities and processes of official intercourse, he took the plain, honest truth in his hands and used it as an honest man. He was guilty of no trick, no double-meaning, no double-dealing. On all occasions, in all places, he was "Honest Abraham Lincoln," with no foolish pride that forbade the acknowledgment and correction of mistakes, and no jealousy that denied to his advisers and helpers their meed of praise. The power which this patent honesty of character and life exercised upon this nation has been one of the most remarkable features of the history of the time. The complete, earnest, immovable faith with which we have trusted his motives has been without a precedent. Men have believed in Abraham Lincoln who believed in nothing higher. Men have believed in him who had lost faith in all around him; and when he died, after demonstrating the value of his personal honesty in the administration of the greatest earthly affairs, he had become the nation's idol.

Again, we loved and honored Mr. Lincoln because he was a Christian. I can never think of that toil-worn man, rising long before his household and spending an hour with his Maker and his Bible, without tears. In that silent hour of communion he has drawn from the fountain which has fed all these qualities that have so won upon our faith and love. Ah! what tears, what prayers, what aspirations, what lamentations, what struggles, have been witnessed by the four walls of that quiet room! Aye, what food have the angels brought him there! There day after day while we have been sleeping has he knelt and prayed for us—prayed for the country, prayed for victory, prayed for wisdom and guidance, prayed

for strength for his great mission, prayed for the accomplishment of his great purposes. There has he found consolation in trial, comfort in defeat and disaster, patience in reverses, courage for labor, wisdom in perplexity, and peace in the consciousness of God's approval. The man who was so humble and so brotherly among men was bowed with filial humility before God. It was while standing among those who had laid down their lives for us that he gave his heart to the One who had laid down his life for him. A praying president? A praying statesman? A praying politician? A praying commander-in-chief of armies and navies? Our foremost man, our highest man, our august ruler, our noblest dignitary, kneeling a simple-hearted child before his heavenly Father? Oh! when shall we see the like of this again? Why should we not mourn the loss of such a man as this? Why should we not love him as we have loved no other chief magistrate? He was a consecrated man—consecrated to his country and his God.

Of Mr. Lincoln's intellect I have said nothing, because there was nothing in his intellect that eminently distinguished him. An acute and strong common sense, sharply individualized by native organization and the peculiar training to which circumstances had subjected it, was his prominent characteristic. He had a perfect comprehension of the leading principles of constitutional government, a thorough belief in the right of every innocent man to freedom, a homely, straightforward mode of reasoning, considerable aptness without elegance of expression, marked readiness of illustration, and quick intuitions that gave him the element of shrewdness. How many men there are in power and out of power of whom much more than this might with truthfulness be said! No, Mr. Lincoln was not a remarkable man intellectually, or if

remarkable not eminently so. Strong without greatness, acute without brilliancy, penetrating but not profound, he was in intellect an average American in the walk of life in which the nation found him. He was loved for the qualities of heart and character which I have attributed to him, and not for those powers and that culture which distinguish the majority of our eminent men.

In the light of these facts, let us look for a moment at what this simple-hearted, loving, honest, Christian man has done. Without an extraordinary intellect, without the training of the schools, without a wide and generous culture, without experience, without the love of two thirds of the nation, without an army or a navy at the beginning, he has presided over and guided to a successful issue the most gigantic national struggle that the history of the world records. He has called to his aid the best men of the time, without a jealous thought that they might overshadow him; he has managed to control their jealousies of each other and compelled them to work harmoniously; he has sifted out from weak and infected material men worthy to command our armies and lead them to victory; he has harmonized conflicting claims, interests, and policies, and in four years has absolutely annihilated the military power of a rebellion thirty years in preparation, and having in its armies the whole military population of a third of the republic, and at its back the entire resources of the men in arms and the producing power of four million slaves. Before he died he saw the rebellion in the last throes of dissolution and knew that his great work was accomplished. Could any one of the great men who surrounded him have done this work as well? If you were doomed to go through it again would you choose for your leader any one of these before Mr. Lincoln? We had a chance to do this but we did

not do it. Mr. Lincoln's election to his second term of office, though occurring at a time when doubt and distrust brooded over the nation, was carried by overwhelming majorities. Heart and head were in the market, but we wisely chose the heart.

The destruction of the military power of the rebellion was Mr. Lincoln's special work. This he did so thoroughly that no chief magistrate will be called upon for centuries to repeat the process. He found the nation weak and tottering to destruction. He left it strong—feared and respected by the nations of the world. He found it full of personal enemies; he leaves it with such multitudes of friends that no one except at personal peril dares to insult his memory. Through this long night of peril and of sorrow, of faithlessness and fear, he has led us into a certain peace—the peace for which we have labored and prayed and bled for these long, long years.

Another work for which Mr. Lincoln will be remembered throughout all the coming generations is the practical emancipation of four million African slaves. His proclamation of emancipation was issued at the right time, and has produced, is producing, will produce, the results he sought to accomplish by it. It weakened the military power of the rebellion and has destroyed all motive to future rebellion. Besides this it accomplished that which was quite as grateful to his benevolent, freedom-loving heart, the abolition of a gigantic wrong—the emancipation of all the bondmen in the land. If he had done no more than this he would have secured for himself the fairest fame it has ever been the fortune of a good man to win. To be regarded and remembered through all coming time as the liberator of a race; to have one's name embalmed in the memory of an enfranchised people and asso-

ciated with every blessing they enjoy and every good they may achieve, is a better fame than the proudest conquerors can boast. We who are white know little of the emotions which thrill the black man's heart to-day. There are no such mourners here as those simple souls among the freedmen who regarded Mr. Lincoln as the noblest personage next to Jesus Christ that ever lived. Their love is deeper than ours; their power of expression less. The tears that stream down those dark faces are charged with a pathos beyond the power of words.

Yet I know not why we may not join hands with them in perfect sympathy, for, under Providence, he has saved us from as many woes as he has them. He has enfranchised the white man as well as the black man. He freed the black man from the bondage of slavery, and he freed the white man from responsibility for it. He has removed from our national politics a power that constantly debauched them. He has destroyed an institution that was a standing disgrace to our nation, a living menace to our form of government, a loud-mouthing witness to our national hypocrisy, a dishonor to Christian civilization.

The destruction of the rebellion and the destruction of slavery are the two great achievements on which the fame of Mr. Lincoln will rest in history; but no man will write the history of these achievements justly who shall not reveal the nature of the power by which they were wrought out. The history which shall fail to show the superiority of the wisdom of an honest, humble, Christian heart over commanding and cultured intellect, will be a graceless libel on Mr. Lincoln's fame. I do not know where in the history of mankind I can find so marked an instance of the power of genuine character and the wisdom of a truthful, earnest

heart, as I see in the immeasurably great results of Mr. Lincoln's administration. I should be false to you, false to the occasion, false to the memory of him we mourn, and false to the God he worshipped and obeyed, if I should fail to adjure you to remember that all our national triumphs of law and humanity over rebellion and barbarism have been won through the wisdom and the power of a simple, honest, Christian heart. Here is the grand lesson we are to learn from the life of Mr. Lincoln. You, Christian men who have voted, and voted, and voted again, for impure men, for selfish men, for drunkards, for unprincipled men, for unchristian men, because they were men of talent, or genius, or accomplishments, or capacity for government, and because you thought that a good head was more important than a good heart, have learned a lesson from the life and achievements of Mr. Lincoln which you cannot forget without sin against God and crime against your country. We have begun to be a Christian nation. We have recognized the controlling power of Providence in our affairs. We have witnessed in the highest seat the power of Christian wisdom and the might of a humble, praying man. Let us see that we remain a Christian nation—that our votes are given to no man who cannot bring to his work the power which has made the name of Abraham Lincoln one of the brightest which illustrates the annals of the nation.

It was the presentiment and prophecy of Mr. Lincoln that his own life and that of the rebellion would end together, but little did he imagine—little did we imagine—that the end of each would be violent. But both parties in the closing scene were in the direct exhibition of their characteristic qualities. Mr. Lincoln went to the theatre not to please himself, but to gratify others. He went with weariness into the

crowd, that the promise under which that crowd had assembled might be fulfilled. The assassin who approached his back, and inflicted upon him his fatal wound, was in the direct exhibition of the spirit of the rebellion. Men who can perjure themselves, and betray a government confided by a trusting and unsuspecting people to their hands, and hunt and hang every man who does not sympathize with their treason, and starve our helpless prisoners by thousands, and massacre troops after they have surrendered, and can glory in these deeds, are not too good for the commission of any dastardly crime which the imagination can conceive. I can understand their shock at the enormous crime. "It will put the war back to Sumter," says one. "It is worse than the surrender of Lee's army," says another. Ah! There's the point. It severs the rebellion from the respect and sympathy of the world. The deed is so utterly atrocious—it exhibits a spirit so fiendish and desperate—that none can defend it, and all turn from it with horror and disgust.

Oh, friends! Oh, countrymen! I dare not speak the thoughts of vengeance that burn within me when I recall this shameless deed. I dare not breathe those imprecations that rise to my lips when I think of this wanton extinction of a great and beneficent life. I can hardly pray for justice, fully measured out to the mad murderer of his truest friend, for, somehow, I feel the presence of that kindly spirit, the magnetism of those kindly eyes, appealing to me to forbear. I have come into such communion with his personality that I cannot escape the power of his charity and his Christian forbearance; and the curse, rising like a bubble from the turbid waters within me, breaks into nothingness in the rarer atmosphere which he throws around me. If he could speak to me from that other shore, he would say, what all his

actions and all his words said of others not less guilty than his assassin: "My murderer was mad and mistaken, as well as malignant. He thought he was doing a great and glorious deed, on behalf of a great and glorious cause. My death was necessary to the perfection of my mission, and was only one sacrifice among hundreds of thousands of others made for the same end."

Ah, that other shore! The commander-in-chief is with his army now. More are they that are with him in victory and peace than they whose names are still upon our muster-rolls. The largest body of the soldiers of the republic pitch their white tents, and unfold their golden banners, and sing their songs of triumph around him. Not his the hosts of worn and wearied bodies; not with him the riddled colors and war-stained uniforms; upon his ears breaks nevermore the dissonance of booming cannon, and clashing saber, and dying groan; but youth and life troop around him with a love purer than ours, and a joy which more than balances our grief.

Our President is dead. He has served us faithfully and well. He has kept the faith; he has finished his course. Henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of glory, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give him in that day. And he who gave him to us, and who so abundantly blessed his labors, and helped him to accomplish so much for his country and his race, will not permit the country which he saved to perish. I believe in the over-ruling providence of God, and that, in permitting the life of our chief magistrate to be extinguished, he only closed one volume of the history of his dealings with this nation, to open another whose pages shall be illustrated with fresh developments of his love and sweeter signs of his mercy. What Mr. Lincoln achieved he

achieved for us ; but he left as choice a legacy in his Christian example, in his incorruptible integrity, and in his unaffected simplicity, if we will appropriate it, as in his public deeds. So we take this excellent life and its results, and, thanking God for them, cease all complaining and press forward under new leaders to new achievements, and the completion of the great work which he who has gone left as a sacred trust upon our hands.

# PRESTON S. BROOKS



PRESTON SMITH BROOKS, American congressman and lawyer, noted for his violent personal assault (May 22, 1856), on Senator Sumner, and for his subsequent quarrel with Anson Burlingame, then a fellow-congressman, was born in Edgefield District, S. C., Aug. 4, 1819, and died at Washington, D. C., Jan. 27, 1857. Graduating at the South Carolina College in 1839, he studied law, and in 1843 was admitted to the Bar. In 1844, he was elected to the South Carolina State legislature, but during the Mexican War served as captain of the Palmetto regiment of South Carolina. In 1853, he was elected to Congress as a States-rights Democrat, and was subsequently twice returned as a member. In May, 1856, he made a brutal assault upon Charles Sumner in the United States Senate chamber, which caused intense indignation throughout the country. The attack was caused by words uttered in a debate by Senator Sumner against Senator Butler, who was a relative of Mr. Brooks. In consequence of his grave offence a committee of the House reported in favor of Mr. Brooks's expulsion, but the motion was lost. After this, Brooks, having had words with Anson Burlingame in a debate, challenged him to a duel, but Brooks failed to appear at the appointed time and place of the hostile meeting. Subsequently he resigned his seat in the House, but was re-elected by his constituents, dying at the capital in his thirty-eighth year.

## SPEECH ON THE SUMNER ASSAULT

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 14, 1856

M R. SPEAKER,—Some time since a senator from Massachusetts allowed himself, in an elaborately prepared speech, to offer a gross insult to my State, and to a venerable friend, who is my State representative, and who was absent at the time.

Not content with that, he published to the world and circulated extensively this uncalled-for libel on my State and my blood. Whatever insults my State insults me. Her history and character have commanded my pious veneration; and in her defence I hope I shall always be prepared, humbly and modestly, to perform the duty of a son. I should have forfeited my own self-respect, and perhaps the good opinion

of my countrymen, if I had failed to resent such an injury by calling the offender in question to a personal account. It was a personal affair, and in taking redress into my own hands I meant no disrespect to the Senate of the United States or to this House.

Nor, sir, did I design insult or disrespect to the State of Massachusetts. I was aware of the personal responsibilities I incurred and was willing to meet them. I knew, too, that I was amenable to the laws of the country, which afford the same protection to all, whether they be members of Congress or private citizens. I did not, and do not now believe, that I could be properly punished, not only in a court of law, but here also, at the pleasure and discretion of the House. I did not then, and do not now, believe that the spirit of American freemen would tolerate slander in high places and permit a member of Congress to publish and circulate a libel on another, and then call upon either House to protect him against the personal responsibilities which he had thus incurred.

But if I had committed a breach of privilege, it was the privilege of the Senate, and not of this House, which was violated. I was answerable there and not here. They had no right, as it seems to me, to prosecute me in these halls, nor have you the right in law or under the constitution, as I respectfully submit, to take jurisdiction over offences committed against them. The constitution does not justify them in making such a request, nor this House in granting it.

If, unhappily, the day should ever come when sectional or party feeling should run so high as to control all other considerations of public duty or justice, how easy it will be to use such precedents for the excuse of arbitrary power, in either house, to expel members of the minority who may have

rendered themselves obnoxious to the prevailing spirit in the House to which they belong.

Matters may go smoothly enough when one House asks the other to punish a member who is offensive to a majority of its own body; but how will it be when, upon a pretence of insulted dignity, demands are made of this House to expel a member who happens to run counter to its party predilections, or other demands which it may not be so agreeable to grant?

It could never have been designed by the constitution of the United States to expose the two Houses to such temptations to collision, or to extend so far the discretionary power which was given to either House to punish its own members for the violation of its rules and orders. Discretion has been said to be the law of the tyrant, and when exercised under the color of the law and under the influence of party dictation it may and will become a terrible and insufferable despotism.

This House, however, it would seem, from the unmistakable tendency of its proceedings, takes a different view from that which I deliberately entertain in common with many others.

So far as public interests or constitutional rights are involved, I have now exhausted my means of defence. I may, then, be allowed to take a more personal view of the question at issue. The further prosecution of this subject, in the shape it has now assumed, may not only involve my friends, but the House itself, in agitations which might be unhappy in their consequences to the country.

If these consequences could be confined to myself individually, I think I am prepared and ready to meet them, here or elsewhere; and when I use this language I mean what I say.

But others must not suffer for me. I have felt more on account of my two friends who have been implicated than for myself, for they have proven that "there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." I will not constrain gentlemen to assume a responsibility on my account which possibly they would not run on their own.

Sir, I cannot, on my own account, assume the responsibility, in the face of the American people, of commencing a line of conduct which in my heart of hearts I believe would result in subverting the foundations of this government and in drenching this hall in blood. No act of mine, on my personal account, shall inaugurate revolution; but when you, Mr. Speaker, return to your own home and hear the people of the great North—and they are a great people—speak of me as a bad man, you will do me the justice to say that a blow struck by me at this time would be followed by revolution—and this I know.

If I desired to kill the senator, why did not I do it? You all admit that I had him in my power. Let me tell the member from New Jersey that it was expressly to avoid taking life that I used an ordinary cane, presented to me by a friend in Baltimore nearly three months before its application to the "bare head" of the Massachusetts senator. I went to work very deliberately, as I am charged—and this is admitted—and speculated somewhat as to whether I should employ a horsewhip or a cowhide; but knowing that the senator was my superior in strength, it occurred to me that he might wrest it from my hand, and then—for I never attempt anything I do not perform—I might have been compelled to do that which I would have regretted the balance of my natural life.

The question has been asked in certain newspapers why I did not invite the senator to personal combat in the mode

usually adopted. Well, sir, as I desire the whole truth to be known about the matter, I will for once notice a newspaper article on the floor of the House and answer here.

My answer is that the senator would not accept a message; and, having formed the unalterable determination to punish him, I believed that the offence of "sending a hostile message," superadded to the indictment for assault and battery, would subject me to legal penalties more severe than would be imposed for a simple assault and battery. That is my answer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nearly finished what I intended to say. If my opponents, who have pursued me with unparalleled bitterness, are satisfied with the present condition of this affair, I am. I return my thanks to my friends, and especially to those who are from non-slave-owning States, who have magnanimously sustained me and felt that it was a higher honor to themselves to be just in their judgment of a gentleman than to be a member of Congress for life. In taking my leave I feel that it is proper that I should say that I believe that some of the votes that have been cast against me have been extorted by an outside pressure at home, and that their votes do not express the feelings or opinions of the members who gave them.

To such of these as have given their votes and made their speeches on the constitutional principles involved, and without indulging in personal vilification, I owe my respect. But, sir, they have written me down upon the history of the country as worthy of expulsion, and in no unkindness I must tell them that for all future time my self-respect requires that I shall pass them as strangers.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I announce to you and to this House that I am no longer a member of the Thirty-fourth Congress.

# FRANCESCO CRISPI




FRANCESCO CRISPI, Italian statesman and "Liberator," was born at Ribera, Sicily, Oct. 4, 1819, and died at Naples, Aug. 11, 1901. After studying law, he took part in the Sicilian expedition of Garibaldi, and served under him as Major at Calatafimi, in 1860, and a year later was elected to the first Italian Parliament for Palermo. He became President of the Chamber of Deputies in 1876, and Minister of the Interior in 1877, but retained the latter office only for one year. In 1878, he became Prime Minister of Italy, a post he held until 1891, and again from 1893 to 1896, when his administration fell in consequence of the disastrous results of the government's forward policy in Africa. In politics, Crispi was a pronounced Liberal, and, despite threatened impeachment for alleged illegal practices, he rendered his country signal service. When the Garibaldi monument was unveiled, in 1895, Crispi was chosen as orator of the occasion.

## ADDRESS TO THE ITALIAN ELECTORS

DELIVERED MAY 23, 1895

FELLOW CITIZENS, DEAREST FRIENDS,—I speak to Italy from Rome, and this is for me, an old Italian, the greatest comfort. Who has seen the past understands me and therefore knows my mind in regard to those to whom I owe highest honor. But the duties which press upon us all in face of the problem which the dying century cannot leave unsolved, and which weigh inexorably upon us, make me tremble. Therefore I beg of you the greatest indulgence. I will be brief and clear, as is my wont.

I held the direction of affairs from August, 1887, to February, 1891. I had it again at the end of December in 1893, not by my will, but constrained by duty. I have never desired or sought power, conscious of its grave responsibility,



*F. Crispi*



familiar with the pains which flow from it. And here let me record facts now belonging to history.

About the end of 1893 the constitution of any government whatever appeared impossible and was nearly so.

At home, rebellion already broken out in some provinces, latent in others, the national consolidarity severed; men's minds perturbed not only by evident ills, but also by the fear and almost the presentiment of greater.

Material disturbance like unto the moral—credit debased, trade hampered, revenues insufficient for the government's needs, and because of the general disorganization the fountains of public and private resources drying up.

Abroad, surprise at all this was attested by diffidence and distrust, and by its reflex action even increased the domestic difficulties. In one word, the government of the last three years had done more harm to Italy than a rout in battle. In that sad moment Italy turned her thoughts to me hopefully.

Was it well, was it ill? I can answer less than any other. Certainly the will of the crown seemed to be, and was ever, one with the will of the country, when his Majesty the King, advice being taken and it appearing that my name was proposed on all sides, including even those who are to-day my bitter enemies, wished to entrust again to me the reins of state. To refuse would have been cowardly. I obeyed.

On December 20, 1893, I spoke thus to Parliament for my colleagues and myself: "We charge upon none the actual state of things; it is the consequence of a series of events which we can record, but should not judge. We will but say that great are the difficulties to be conquered; and that to uplift credit, put in order the finances, strengthen the authority of law, and to bring the country to a true knowledge

of itself, we need the support of the chamber without distinction of party. To this end we ask of you a sacred truce. When Italy's future is assured, each shall resume his place. To combat now, to set ourselves one against the other—let me affirm it with patriotic breath, would be a crime. When peril advances we should all unite in the common defence.

But we spoke to a chamber which could not act. It had been disorganized because the electors had not been called to vote upon a programme based on principles. The manner of the elections, the seductions practised, the freedom of the ballot taken from many by violence or corruption, the lavish, lawless, promises impressed on the new representation the stamp of an original sin. The chamber showed itself convinced of this, like us, when it consented to the revision of the electoral lists, explicitly declaring its own corrupt origin.

At all events the contagion of good appeared at first to be possible and effective. Whether it were the sinking of public and private fortunes, the shame of recent ill success and proved incapacity, and the fear of arousing by partisan instability the popular wrath—a productive period of restorative work even with that chamber seemed possible. The effect was soon felt.

The sight of Italy showing herself capable of re-creating her government, with sincere and practical seriousness, surrounded by the sympathy of the country, gave new life to foreign confidence. At home rebellion was turned, credit uplifted, the finances on the way to restoration, through a programme dependent upon the truth, replaced a false consideration for the taxpayer with the evident utility of a final effort. This effort, partially, but with some reluctance agreed to by the chamber, was accepted by the nation with that good sense which is the real basis of Italian character.

The path was regained, the career resumed. The moment for evil to reassert itself had therefore come.

The violent, certain of the unpopularity to which they would have condemned themselves, had been silent while there was danger of disruption, the unworthy who had been hurled from power, the incapable who had had to put away ambition and should have renounced it, now all took up the cry, and when we were almost at the goal, the invidious and jealous coalition of the disaffected sought to turn Parliament from its path and to again cast the country over a precipice of miseries.

Thus the national tribune became a seat for defamation; parliamentary immunity, an immunity of offence, and personal encounters replaced the contest for principles.

Calumny is no new weapon in politics; in democratic countries it has succeeded to the mediæval poison and dagger, and recourse to it is had all the more readily, when the pebble of some unsuccessful David, or the bullet of some fanatical assassin have failed. Never was it so clamorous, violent, and insinuating, keen and comprehensive as now, tricked out artfully and ably ordered.

It counted upon the disguise which such warfare would arouse in a man who, reaching the decline of a long and wearisome career, must aspire before all else for peace.

If I had yielded and bent before this new system for provoking ministerial crises by defamation, accepting the convenient theory that a minister (however much censured), ought to defend himself and resign his powers meanwhile, thus giving to the meanest of insulters a right to change the government of the country—the country would have quickly seen with more disgust than wonder, vituperation freshly changed into hosannas.

But before to-day I learned to suffer in the fulfilment of duty, and I resisted. I resisted because I could prove that more than ever there was political nihilism outside the government, and because war was being made far less upon the man than upon the régime he represented.

I never compromise and they all know it. I resisted and my suffering was dear to me, because to suffer for a just cause is the greatest of honors. Ours was just and most noble; and since the means of which a Parliament ordinarily disposes were insufficient to unveil the plot, the ministry concordantly proposed to the crown the prorogation of the session. This was without hesitation, but not without regret.

Still we all took comfort that in the prorogation we all submitted ourselves to the primary judgment of the country, and this judgment was as explicit as just.

This régime, which is wont to be called the decree-law, is a serious matter; it is declared to be in contradiction to the statute by those who have been first to recur to it, not alone needlessly, but fruitlessly, for the finances of the State and national economy. Our use of it apart from our purity of intention was legitimized by success.

To be sure the very insuccess of the most fierce and predatory opposition made these opponents still more fanatical. Insomuch that losing entirely the sense of patriotism and humanity more than one among them augured—to the advantage of barbarisms—defeat to those arms which we had been obliged to take up in Africa, to defend ourselves from treason and to guard civilization.

But victory smiled upon us. Our soldiery, valorous, patient, and ready for fatigue, battle, and sacrifice, the stuff for heroes to-day as for martyrs yesterday, strengthened by wise organization, guided by that wise boldness which is one na-

tional tradition in war, renewed the bright days of that glory which seemed to have set forever.

Blessed be that victory! The Italian heavens, clouded by the fogs of defamation, shone again, and the atmosphere, heavy with speculation and scandal, cleared away. A thrill of renewing vigor ran through the national fibre, and a wave of sympathetic respect flowed in from all the world.

We can to-day vaunt of peace with honor, since if bloody conquests have spoken of our valor, our diplomacy has found pleasure and success in demonstrating the union of our interests and our ideals. From Morocco to the extreme Orient, from one America to the other, my colleague of the foreign department has proven that equity is with Italy, and equity means advantage. So that there has never been as now such cordial relationships between our own and other governments—never greater respect for our country in its international rights. Thus was crushed the other story of provocative politics; proved futile the attempt to gain belief in a plan of crazy adventure in Africa, while we were measuring only too closely our successes by our immediate financial possibilities, watched over with the glance of a miser by my friend and colleague of the treasury, and by other eminent associates not less severe than he; accused men of acting as slave-traders in the face of our country—but all this in vain, the opposition at last shifted over to an effort to excite compassion as victims—or authors, as might be—of a social conflict.

But we do not hide from ourselves certainly either the gravity or the urgency of the forms which the social problem assumes among us. Is it possible to distinguish socialists from anarchists?

Certain it is that in other countries—although one cannot tell clearly where socialism ends and anarchy begins—there is serious study and sincere conviction, together with an assumption of great interest in the masses which can make respectable that principle of socialism which is indeed a negation of individual freedom, while anarchy is only perpetual war.

But among us on the other hand there are only the caprices of theorists changing their programme daily, banners waving in the wind of popularity; shameful sentimentality shifting from one object to its extreme opposite; and the ambition of politicians turning indifferently to any party if only they may succeed; even good faith undeniable to many is seldom strengthened by authority. Indeed this propaganda of socialism has brought no benefit to the real sufferings of our people, sufferings which I shall be the last to deny. So socialists and anarchists have accomplished nothing but to distract the government from effective provisions, to render repressive laws inevitable as the exceptional but necessary result of their behavior. We might have responded with violence which the peril and the injury to society would have justified, to the crimes committed with weapons, dynamite, and fire, to robbery, to evil provocation wrought with wicked words upon ignorant and senseless crowds. But we have limited ourselves in most instances to that measure of preservation found in the supervision of a prescribed residence and restriction of that personal liberty which had been abused.

Further, what was the disposition of the government toward those on whom less merited punishment has fallen, is proved by the clement measures proposed by us to the king's compassion, and by the many who have been liberated in these recent months, no less than the care given to studying

that part of the social problem dependent upon legislative provisions, as attested by projects which may be opportunely modified, but show undeniable inspiration.

Yet we have seen these projects combatted by the very people who on the other hand allied themselves with the authors and encouragers of disorder—a monstrous amalgamation of contradictions. Aristocracy, socialism, radicalism, and anarchy were to be seen marching in affectionate embrace, one party approving whatever legitimate demands another made, and together all aiming at a general destruction. Thus the disorder is double—material and moral.

One would say that history teaches nothing to those who should most treasure its lessons, still they aspire by governing the country to become historical themselves. This is no republic, and we have not then to fear that the excesses of any sort of radical will lead us to Cæsarism; the modifying power here is fortunately permanent and loyal, and our institutions rest upon the heart as well as the good sense of the people.

Still it is edifying—this strange marriage which unites in the name of liberty, those who are for opposite reasons the negation of it—those who invoked the scaffold in its defence, and they would attain it by distinction.

Liberty does not lack in Italy, but a wise use of it rather. It is less in our habits than in our legislation, where I think it an honor to have taken a large part. This the public knows so well that every renewed effort to bind together those who would make liberty the pretext for vain agitation, falls under popular indifference.

The statesman's duty is to oppose public opinion whenever he sees it deviate from the ends toward which it should tend for the good of the fatherland, and guilty are they who yield

and flatter, in the craze for mere popularity, when they should protest and resist. We needed no proof of it, for the conviction was deep and general that a new chamber was indispensable—new in origin, elementally in part, in discipline, in programme and a firm will to adhere thereto. Therefore it is that we have summoned the electors, and that we stand before you that you may judge us according to our desires and our accomplishments.

Our intentions are not to be counted with those which pave the infernal streets. All have seen and know how they have been prevented from becoming facts and by whom. Facts they will yet become if you continue your favor in this same effort.

In spite of most adverse circumstances and of the attempt of the hostile coalition to arrest government action, this has moved on surely, and this ministry, presenting itself for judgment to the nation, has to credit results so incontestable that our adversaries, knowing them undenial, have had to seek elsewhere arms with which to fight us.

More and better we feel we can do when we may labor no longer alone, but with the concurrence of Parliament. We desire above all to make the Italian people forget the dark and shameful things which have perturbed in this late period of its national life—and this with a civil as well as material reparation.

The union into a political statehood lived in Italian thought before it came to pass. Such thought was the Italian's ideal patrimony and fortune; and foreigners themselves, though dominating it, respected it, such light beamed from it and hallowed the cause of our redemption. To-day memories are not life but death; hence the supreme need of a national education, serving above all as a stimulus to good. Instead there

is moral inertia in many, and, worse yet, such a scorn of what is patriotic, spiritually active, and fruitful, that the best can sometimes accomplish little.

I tried to put Italians on their guard against this scepticism of thought and action when I pointed out the existence of a new monster, bearing upon its banner "Neither God nor Chief," and summoned to combat it a gathering of honest men of whatever faith, inscribing instead upon our banner, "With God and the King for Fatherland." Some made believe to be afraid, crying out against me as a reactionist, pretending that I sought to initiate an anti-liberal movement and renounce the conquests of civilization.

Puerile accusation! The modern state lives not without liberty in all classes of its society, in every manifestation of its practical vitality. But as liberty means not license, and as the liberty of each finds natural limits in the liberty of all, there is no offence to liberty in reacting against nihilism of every kind—of conscience no less than of government.

Government should imply providence, and to be provident a government must be free in its actions. But on account of much that happened during the last period of the closed legislative session the need has become most evident that some points scarcely indicated in the constitution should be elucidated and confirmed by a duly sanctioned ministerial responsibility.

But to prevent the repetition of past melancholy phenomena you must assume your share of the burden, Italian electors, renouncing nihilism above all things, at the polls.

If you wish the public life to develop itself as you would have it, you must begin by participating in it, by a judicious use of your own votes. Choose, then, between us and our friends and our adversaries! Who and what we are you

have seen to know! What our adversaries are and what they could give you needs not to be said. Conspirators disguised as moralists, knowing that the country was with it, they have substituted calumny for criticism, some careless, others even desirous that perils should gather about our institutions in their overthrow of the existing government.

Why thus destroy? Because a coalition of anarchists, monarchists, "plebiscite" radicals, federal republicans, socialists, and pseudo-conservatives could have no other aspiration. Before such discordant elements could combine in real unity they must begin by converting one another, which their own contradictory programmes recognize as impossible. If it conquered it could not form a government even of the worst, and assuredly not good. But it will not conquer!

The dilemma before the electors to-day is simple but solemn—the choice between the national monarchy and social, moral, and political anarchy. To fight such anarchy is the duty now imposed on every good citizen.

In the king, symbol and strong safeguard of national unity, the king surrounded by democratic institutions, is our trust. Let not fail that trust. Neither by doubt nor by the withholding of votes. To refrain from the ballot is desertion in the hour of battle; to doubt, the first step toward defeat.

So I make my appeal to all Italians, and I believe that my voice will be heard, because all good men have herein one common interest. Parties must be reformed upon honest and logical bases, so that there may be an interchange of ideas between men and their government. And the renunciation of power will be welcome to me when I can retire without baseness, without fear for the security of our institutions.

Let us unite our hearts then, elevating them in the senti-

ment of a supreme duty, alert and calm as in the best of days, assured that the work of social pacification and the re-organization of the state are no less important than the struggles for independent unity and their national, final development.

Close up, then, around the king, and with our glance bent on the Cross of Savoy, resplendent upon the nation's banner, let us, too, cry "*In hoc signo vinces!*"

[Special translation by Mary E. Adams.]

# HENRY J. RAYMOND



HENRY JARVIS RAYMOND, American politician, journalist, and orator, was born at Lima, N. Y., Jan. 24, 1820, and died there June 18, 1869. Educated at the University of Vermont, he studied law in New York city, and then taking up the profession of journalism became assistant-editor of the "New York Tribune," 1841-43, and editor of the "New York Courier and Enquirer," 1843-50. In 1849, he entered the State legislature as a Whig member and was re-elected in the following year. In September, 1851, he issued the first number of the "New York Times," the editor of which he became and continued for the remainder of his life. Mr. Raymond was a delegate to the Baltimore Whig convention of 1852, making there an able speech justifying Northern sentiment on the questions then at issue, and in the organization of the Republican party in 1856 took a prominent part. He declined a nomination for the governorship of New York in 1857, and in 1860, favored Seward as a Presidential candidate. During the Civil War, Raymond was again a member of the State legislature, and in 1864, he entered the Federal Congress, making there, in December, 1865, a notable speech in which he maintained that the Southern States had never been out of the Union. He was a supporter of the reconstruction policy of President Johnson and wrote an "Address and Declaration of Principles," which the Loyalists' convention at Philadelphia, in 1866, issued and disseminated. He declined a renomination to Congress and also the Austrian mission tendered him by President Johnson. Mr. Raymond as a speaker had much force and the power of effective address; he is, however, best known as a journalist, who exerted a wholesome influence in softening the asperities of newspaper controversy. His published writings consist of "Political Lessons of the Revolution" (1854); "History of the Administration of President Lincoln" (1864), revised in the following year and issued under the title of "Life and Public Services of Abraham Lincoln."

## SPEECH ON RECONSTRUCTION

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DECEMBER 21, 1865

M R. CHAIRMAN,—I should be glad, if it meet the sense of those members who are present, to make some remarks upon the general question before the House; but I do not wish to trespass at all upon their disposition in regard to this matter. I do not know, however, that there will be a better opportunity to say what little I

have to say than is now offered; and if the House shall indicate no other wish, I will proceed to say it.

I need not say that I have been gratified to hear many things which have fallen from the lips of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Finck], who has just taken his seat. I have no party feeling, nor any other feeling, which would prevent me from rejoicing in the indications apparent on that side of the House of a purpose to concur with the loyal people of the country, and with the loyal administration of the government, and with the loyal majorities in both Houses of Congress, in restoring peace and order to our common country. I cannot, perhaps, help wishing, sir, that these indications of an interest in the preservation of our government had come somewhat sooner. I cannot help feeling that such expressions cannot now be of as much service to the country as they might once have been.

If we could have had from that side of the House such indications of an interest in the preservation of the Union, such heartfelt sympathy with the efforts of the government for the preservation of that Union, such hearty denunciation of those who were seeking its destruction, while the war was raging, I am sure we might have been spared some years of war, some millions of money, and rivers of blood and tears.

But, sir, I am not disposed to fight over again battles now happily ended. I feel, and I am rejoiced to find that members on the other side of the House feel, that the great problem now before us is to restore the Union to its old integrity, purified from everything that interfered with the full development of the spirit of liberty which it was made to enshrine.

I trust that we shall have a general concurrence of the members of this House and of this Congress in such measures

as may be deemed most fit and proper for the accomplishment of that result. I am glad to assume and to believe that there is not a member of this House, nor a man in this country, who does not wish, from the bottom of his heart, to see the day speedily come when we shall have this nation—the great American Republic—again united, more harmonious in its action than it ever has been, and forever one and indivisible. We in this Congress are to devise the means to restore its union and its harmony, to perfect its institutions, and to make it in all its parts and in all its action, through all time to come, too strong, too wise, and too free ever to invite or ever to permit the hand of rebellion again to be raised against it.

Now, sir, in devising those ways and means to accomplish that great result, the first thing we have to do is to know the point from which we start, to understand the nature of the material with which we have to work—the condition of the territory and the States with which we are concerned. I had supposed at the outset of this session that it was the purpose of this House to proceed to that work without discussion, and to commit it almost exclusively, if not entirely, to the joint committee raised by the two Houses for the consideration of that subject.

But, sir, I must say that I was glad when I perceived the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Stevens], himself the chairman on the part of this House of that great committee on reconstruction, lead off in a discussion of this general subject, and thus invite all the rest of us who choose to follow him in the debate. In the remarks which he made in this body a few days since, he laid down, with the clearness and the force which characterize everything he says and does, his point of departure in commencing this great work.

I had hoped that the ground he would lay down would be such that we could all of us stand upon it and co-operate with him in our common object. I feel constrained to say, sir—and do it without the slightest disposition to create or to exaggerate differences—that there were features in his exposition of the condition of the country with which I cannot concur. I cannot for myself start from precisely the point which he assumes.

In his remarks on that occasion he assumed that the States lately in rebellion were and are out of the Union. Throughout his speech—I will not trouble you with reading passages from it—I find him speaking of those States as “outside of the Union,” as “dead States,” as having forfeited all their rights and terminated their State existence. I find expressions still more definite and distinct; I find him stating that they “are and for four years have been out of the Union for all legal purposes;” as having been for four years a “separate power,” and “a separate nation.”

His position therefore is that these States, having been in rebellion, are now out of the Union and are simply within the jurisdiction of the constitution of the United States as so much territory to be dealt with precisely as the will of the conqueror, to use his own language, may dictate. Now, sir, if that position is correct it prescribes for us one line of policy to be pursued very different from the one that will be proper if it is not correct.

His belief is that what we have to do is to create new States out of this territory at the proper time—many years distant—retaining them meantime in a territorial condition and subjecting them to precisely such a state of discipline and tutelage as Congress or the government of the United States may see fit to prescribe. If I believed in the premises which

he assumes, possibly, though I do not think probably, I might agree with the conclusion he has reached.

But, sir, I cannot believe that this is our condition. I cannot believe that these States have ever been out of the Union or that they are now out of the Union. I cannot believe that they ever have been or are now in any sense a separate power. If they were, sir, how and when did they become so? They were once States of this Union—that every one concedes; bound to the Union and made members of the Union by the constitution of the United States. If they ever went out of the Union it was at some specific time and by some specific act.

I regret that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Stevens] is not now in his seat. I should have been glad to ask him by what specific act and at what precise time any one of those States took itself out of the American Union. Was it by the ordinance of secession? I think we all agree that an ordinance of secession passed by any State of this Union is simply a nullity, because it encounters in its practical operation the constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land. It could have no legal actual force or validity. It could not operate to effect any actual change in the relations of the State adopting it to the national government, still less to accomplish the removal of that State from the sovereign jurisdiction of the constitution of the United States.

Well, sir, did the resolutions of the States, the declarations of their officials, the speeches of members of their legislatures, or the utterances of their press accomplish the result? Certainly not. They could not possibly work any change whatever in the relations of these States to the general government. All their ordinances and all their resolutions were

simply declarations of a purpose to secede. Their secession, if it ever took place, certainly could not date from the time when their intention to secede was first announced.

After declaring that intention they proceeded to carry it into effect. How? By war. By sustaining their purpose by arms against the force which the United States brought to bear against it. Did they sustain it? Were their arms victorious? If they were then their secession was an accomplished fact. If not it was nothing more than an abortive attempt—a purpose unfulfilled. This, then, is simply a question of fact and we all know what the fact is. They did not succeed. They failed to maintain their ground by force of arms—in other words, they failed to secede.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Stevens] insists that they did secede, and that this fact is not in the least affected by the other fact that the constitution forbids secession. He says that the law forbids murder, but that murders are nevertheless committed. But there is no analogy between the two cases. If secession had been accomplished, if these States had gone out and overcome the armies that tried to prevent their going out, then the prohibition of the constitution could not have altered the fact.

In the case of murder the man is killed, and murder is thus committed in spite of the law. The fact of killing is essential to the committal of the crime; and the fact of going out is essential to secession. But in this case there was no such fact. I think I need not argue any further the position that the rebel States have never for one moment, by any ordinances of secession, or by any successful war, carried themselves beyond the rightful jurisdiction of the constitution of the United States.

They have interrupted for a time the practical enforce-

ment and exercise of that jurisdiction; they rendered it impossible for a time for this government to enforce obedience to its laws; but there has never been an hour when this government, or this Congress, or this House, or the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself, ever conceded that those States were beyond the jurisdiction of the constitution and laws of the United States. . . .

Why, sir, if there be no constitution of any sort in a State, no law, nothing but chaos, then that State would no longer exist as an organization. But that has not been the case, it never is the case in great communities, for they always have constitutions and forms of government. It may not be a constitution or form of government adapted to its relation to the government of the United States; and that would be an evil to be remedied by the government of the United States.

That is what we have been trying to do for the last four years. The practical relations of the governments of those States with the government of the United States were all wrong—were hostile to that government. They denied our jurisdiction and they denied that they were States of the Union, but their denial did not change the fact; and there was never any time when their organizations as States were destroyed. A dead State is a solecism, a contradiction in terms, an impossibility.

These are, I confess, rather metaphysical distinctions, but I did not raise them. Those who assert that a State is destroyed whenever its constitution is changed, or whenever its practical relations with this government are changed, must be held responsible for whatever metaphysical niceties may be necessarily involved in the discussion. I do not know, sir, that I have made my views on this point clear to

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley], who has questioned me upon it, and I am still more doubtful whether, even if they are intelligible, he will concur with me as to their justice. But I regard these States as just as truly within the jurisdiction of the constitution, and therefore just as really and truly States of the American Union now, as they were before the war.

Their practical relations to the constitution of the United States have been disturbed, and we have been endeavoring through four years of war to restore them and make them what they were before the war. The victory in the field has given us the means of doing this; we can now re-establish the practical relations of those States to the government. Our actual jurisdiction over them, which they vainly attempted to throw off, is already restored. The conquest we have achieved is a conquest over the rebellion, not a conquest over the States whose authority the rebellion had for a time subverted. . . .

I think, moreover, that we accept virtually and practically the doctrine of State sovereignty, the right of a State to withdraw from the Union, and to break up the Union at its own will and pleasure. I do not see how upon those premises we can escape that conclusion. If the States that engaged in the late rebellion constituted themselves by their ordinances of secession or by any of the acts with which they followed those ordinances, a separate and independent power, I do not see how we can deny the principles on which they professed to act or refuse assent to their practical results. I have heard no clearer, no stronger statement of the doctrine of State sovereignty as paramount to the sovereignty of the nation than would be involved in such a concession.

# LORD COLERIDGE



SIR JOHN DUKE, BARON COLERIDGE, eminent English jurist, lord chief-justice, orator, and author, son of Sir John Taylor Coleridge, editor of Blackstone's "Commentaries," was born at Ottery St. Mary, Devon, Dec. 3, 1820, and died at London, June 14, 1894. He was educated at Eton, and Balliol College, Oxford, and after gaining a fellowship at Exeter College studied law and was called to the Bar at the Middle Temple, London, in 1847. He became recorder of Portsmouth in 1858, queen's counsel in 1861, and from 1865 to 1873 sat in Parliament as member for Exeter. Although Coleridge early became famous as a speaker, his practice for a time was limited, but after some years his services were in more frequent demand and he was retained as counsel in a number of celebrated cases. In 1868, he was appointed solicitor-general, in 1871 attorney-general, and in 1873 he became chief-justice of the court of common pleas, and was created Baron Coleridge. In 1880, on the death of Sir Alexander Cockburn, Coleridge succeeded him as lord chief-justice of England. In 1833, the chief-justice made a tour in the United States, where he was received with enthusiasm and made a number of eloquent speeches and addresses. Coleridge was a finished speaker, his forensic efforts wanting neither the graces of style nor able reasoning, combined with impressiveness of delivery. Besides his great legal acquirements, he was a man of fine literary tastes, and he contributed frequently to periodicals. He was a brilliant conversationalist, and his friendships, both literary and professional, were extensive. In politics, he was a Liberal and a warm supporter of Mr. Gladstone.

## ON THE VALUE OF CLEAR VIEWS AS TO THE LAWS REGULATING THE ENJOYMENT OF PROPERTY

FROM ADDRESS TO THE GLASGOW JURIDICAL SOCIETY IN THE QUEEN'S  
ROOMS, MAY 25, 1887

**I**T seems an elementary proposition that a free people can deal as it thinks fit with its common stock, and can prescribe to its citizens rules for its enjoyment, alienation, and transmission. Yet in practice this seems to be anything but admitted. There are estates in these islands of more than a million acres. These islands are not very large. It is plainly conceivable that estates might grow to fifteen

million acres or to more. Further, it is quite reasonably possible that the growth of a vast emporium of commerce might be checked, or even a whole trade lost to the country by the simple will of one, or it may be more than one, great land-owner.

Sweden is a country, speaking comparatively, small and poor; but I have read in a book of authority that in Sweden at the time of the Reformation three fifths of the land were in mortmain and what was actually the fact in Sweden might come to be the fact in Great Britain. These things might be for the general advantage, and if they could be shown to be so, by all means they should be maintained. But if not, does any man possessing anything which he is pleased to call his mind deny that a state of law under which such mischiefs could exist, under which a country itself would exist, not for its people but for a mere handful of them, ought to be instantly and absolutely set aside?

Certainly there are men who, if they do not assert, imply the negative. A very large coal owner some years ago interfered with a high hand in one of the coal strikes. He sent for the workmen. He declined to argue but he said, stamping with his foot upon the ground, "All the coal within so many square miles is mine, and if you do not instantly come to terms not a hundredweight of it shall be brought to the surface, and it shall all remain unworked."

This utterance of his was much criticised at the time. By some it was held up as a subject for panegyric and a model for imitation; the manly utterance of one who would stand no nonsense, determined to assert his rights of property and to tolerate no interference with them. By others it was denounced as insolent and brutal, and it was suggested that if a few more men said such things, and a few men acted

on them, it would very probably result in the coal owners having not much right of property left to interfere with. To me it seemed then, and seems now, an instance of that density of perception and inability to see distinctions between things inherently distinct of which I have said so much.

I should myself deny that the mineral treasures under the soil of a country belong to a handful of surface proprietors in the sense in which this gentleman appeared to think they did. That fifty or a hundred gentlemen, or a thousand, would have a right, by agreeing to shut the coal mines, to stop the manufactures of Great Britain and to paralyze her commerce seems to me, I must frankly say, unspeakably absurd.

It is not even the old idea about such things. Coal-mining is comparatively recent; but the custom of bounding as to tin in Cornwall, the customs of the High Peak in Derbyshire as to lead, the legal rule everywhere as to gold and silver, are enough to show that in these matters the general advantage was in former days openly and avowedly regarded, and that when rights of private property interfered with it they were summarily set at naught. To extend to coal and copper the old law applicable to tin and lead may be wise or foolish, but is surely no more an assault on property itself than was the old law which prescribed that, in certain places, and under certain circumstances, the owner of the surface should not prevent the winning of mineral treasure by others entirely unconnected with him or with the surface land. It is not to the point to say that these laws were found to be inconvenient, and have in some places and to some extent been abrogated.

It may be so. Inconvenience, that is, that they were not in practice found to be for the general advantage, is a very

good reason for abrogating them. That they existed and had to be modified on grounds of expediency is a proof of the point for which I am contending, namely, that these old laws show that the distinction I think so important was early and largely recognized; and that while property itself was acknowledged, the laws of its enjoyment were regulated according to what was thought to be the general advantage.

I am told, but I do not know of my own knowledge, that the laws in Prussia against the landowner and in favor of the discoverer and winner of mineral treasures are still more stringent than those of Cornwall or Derbyshire, yet, I suppose, that no one will contend that in Prussia the laws of property are disregarded, or that the principle of property is unsafe.

Take again, for a moment, the case of perpetuities, to which I have more than once alluded, as exemplified in gifts *inter vivos*, or in what, by a common but strange abuse of language, are called "munificent bequests," after a man has had all the enjoyment possible to him, to religious or charitable objects. Persons either not capable of attributing definite meaning to their language, or at least not accustomed to do so, talk of any interference with such dispositions as immoral, and brand it as sacrilege.

The wisest clergyman who ever lived, as Mr. Arnold calls Bishop Butler, pointed out nearly 150 years ago that all property is and must be regulated by the laws of the community; that we may with a good conscience retain any property whatever, whether coming from the Church or no, to which the laws of the State give title; that no man can give what he did not receive; and that, as no man can himself have a perpetuity, so he cannot give it to any one else. No answer has ever been attempted to Bishop Butler; none seems pos-

sible; yet men go on, like the Priest and Levite, pass it by on the other side and repeat the parrot cry of immorality and sacrilege without ever taking the trouble to clear their minds, perhaps being congenitally unable to do so, or to ascertain whether there is any argument which will "hold" upon which to justify the charge. These are they who

" might move  
The wise man to that scorn which wisdom holds  
Unlawful ever,"

and from whom I part with this one word. There may be abundant and very good reasons for maintaining the inviolability of all gifts or bequests in perpetuity, there may be abundant and very good reasons for maintaining the contrary, but to call names does not advance an argument; abuse is not reasoning, and moderate and reasonable men are apt to distrust the soundness of a cause which needs such arts and employs such weapons.

Furthermore, it is often said that you may no doubt alter the laws of property on a proper case being shown for the alteration. Sensible men see that what Bishop Butler calls "plain absurdities" follow from any other doctrine. It would indeed be difficult, in the face of railway bills, gas bills, water bills, tramway bills, dock bills, harbor bills (the catalogue is endless) passed by the hundred every year through both Houses of Parliament, to deny that private property may be rightly interfered with for the public good, even when the public is represented chiefly, if not entirely, by a small band of speculators.

But then it is said you have no right to do it, except on proper compensation. I ask respectfully, however, what is the exact meaning of these words, especially "right" and "proper"? Is the absolute right,—right, I say, not power,

for that no man questions,—is the absolute right of the State intended to be denied to deal with the common stock with or without compensation; and by proper compensation is it meant that the compensation is to be proper in the opinion of the person compensated, or the person compensating or of whom?

Or is it intended to say only that any change in the tenure of property or of the laws of property made by law should be made with as little suffering to individuals as may be, and with as much consideration as possible for the present holders and present expectants of property, whether real or personal. If the latter proposition is intended no man in his senses will differ from it. Men to whose personal loss the law is altered are, as matter of common fairness, to be considered in every way, and nothing should be done to their detriment which it is possible to avoid. Every one will agree in this.

But if the right is questioned, and if the sufficiency of the compensation is to be determined by the person compensated, let this be considered. A foreign army lands, or a foreign fleet threatens our coasts. The general in command of the district, in the name of the Sovereign, that is, of the State, orders the destruction of a house which, if left standing, might be an important military position for the invading army; or it may be, as a military precaution, a large tract of cultivated country, gardens, orchards, or the like, has to be laid entirely waste. Have the owners a claim, a legal right, to compensation?

It has been decided for centuries, in accordance with good sense, most certainly not. *Salus populi suprema lex.*<sup>1</sup> Take another case which has actually happened. Parliament supplies the funds for a great public and national harbor,

---

<sup>1</sup> The safety of the people is the paramount law.

created by a huge breakwater, which the officers of the Sovereign construct. The effect of this great national work is to turn the tide of the sea full on to the lands of a beach-bounded proprietor some miles off, who could only save his land from utter destruction by the erection of a long and massive sea wall. Has he a claim, a legal right, to compensation? Again I answer most certainly not. *Salus populi suprema lex.*

Many other cases might be put to which the answer would be the same but these are enough for my purpose. And now as to the sufficiency of the compensation. The property is taken and often in the opinion of him who loses it no compensation is sufficient. Suppose the possessor of an ancient and beautiful house, endeared to him by a thousand tender and noble memories, is told that he must part with it for the public good. The public good comes to him, perhaps, represented by an engineer, a contractor, an attorney, a parliamentary agent, and a parliamentary counsel. He is very likely well off in point of money and does not at all want the compensation; but he is a man of feeling, or, if you will, of imagination, and he does want his house. He does not believe in the public caring two straws for the railway between Eatanswill and Mudborough. He thinks it hard that the engineer and the rest of them should pull down his old hall, and root up his beautiful pleasure-grounds.

But he is told that the public good requires it, that a jury will give him compensation, and that he has no cause for complaint; and told sometimes by the very people who, when it is proposed to apply the same process for the same reasons to other rights or laws of property, are frantic in their assertion of the sacredness of these laws, and vehemently maintain that to touch one of them is to assail the existence of

property and dissolve society. Once more let us see things as they are, recognize distinctions, admit consequences, clear our minds, and if we must differ, as probably we must, let us differ without calling names or imputing motives.

These are individual instances; but all history, and in a high degree the history of these islands is full of examples in which the principle has been unhesitatingly applied to whole classes in the name of the public good. To corporations it has been constantly extended, artificial persons so far as the corporation itself goes, we know, yet made up of individuals who have had to submit to deprivation of property and consequent loss of position without a shadow of compensation.

Monasteries, colleges, convents, corporation boroughs, and other corporations have all at different times of our history and under different circumstances been thought either partly or entirely inconsistent with the general welfare; and accordingly their property has been taken from them, sometimes wholly, sometimes in part, sometimes by compulsory sale, sometimes by simple removal. Great proprietors in many cases now stand in the place of these corporations without any injury to the principle of property, though as a consequence of great changes in the laws regulating its enjoyment. And if in times to come, by the same means and for the same reasons other classes of the nation were to stand in the place of these great proprietors, it would not more follow then than it has followed now that the principle of property would be assailed, though the laws by which it is enjoyed might change.

All laws of property must stand upon the foot of general advantage; a country belongs to the inhabitants; in what proportions and by what rules its inhabitants are to own it

must be settled by the law; and the moment a fragment of the people set up rights inherent in themselves and not founded on the public good, "plain absurdities" follow.

This at least seems to have been the view which consciously or unconsciously governed the English lawyers who invented, so greatly to the general advantage, the laws of copyhold. When the tenants had created the farms and built the homesteads on land which they held at the will of the lord, and out of which by the theory of the law they could be turned at his pleasure, though they had made one and built the other; and in respect of which, by the same theory, the lord might have made them pay a heavy rent for what was the fruit of their own hands; the English lawyers intervened with the healing doctrine of the custom of the manor by which fixity of tenure was secured to the tenant and the lord's exactions were curbed within fixed and reasonable limits. Compulsory enfranchisement has followed of late years; but the mitigating effect of manorial custom in harsher times can hardly be overrated; and the absence of such an influence in the sister island, where there are no manors, has sharpened and intensified those hostile feelings between the lord and the tenant which are apt to grow up even in the most favorable circumstances and under the best system of land laws in the world.









DEPEW, C.M., ed.

PN  
6121

The library of oratory.  
vol. 9

D4  
v.9



